

like the Executive, we ought not to criticize and oppose acts in which the honor of the country is involved, and the opposition to the acquisition of Santo Domingo was one of those disgraceful acts committed here—not intentionally so, but growing out of passion, heat, and trivial matters which ought not to enter into the consideration of such a great question. It belittled the men connected with it, and when the history of those times is written those men will not shine as they otherwise might.

But I shall not debate the details of that controversy. I do not wish to rake up the past; I am willing that it shall now rest. I simply want to repeat that that proposition was defeated by an acrimonious personal controversy against President Grant, in which the parties making war on him were all wrong. We lost Santo Domingo, which we ought to have had, as it is the chain of defense, as was properly stated by the Senator from Idaho. I hope and believe that none of that feeling will enter into this question when we come to vote on the pending treaty. I believe every Senator here will vote on this treaty according to his judgment as to the result to be accomplished. The saying of a few things against the President will amount to nothing. That is all very well; but I believe in the final action we shall rise higher than Senators did at the time they rejected the Santo Domingo treaty. I am glad to see my Democratic friends recognizing the fact that the accomplishment of the great object which the United States wants to accomplish is paramount to any criticism that can be made of any administration.

DISTRICT COURT FOR OREGON.

Mr. MITCHELL. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the bill (S. 3117) to expedite business in the district court of the United States for the district of Oregon. It is a short bill, reported unanimously by the Committee on the Judiciary.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill. It provides that in case of the absence of the United States district judge for the district of Oregon from that district, or of his disability, a circuit judge of the United States of the circuit to which the district belongs may hold the district court and perform the duties of the district judge.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY.

Mr. CULLOM. I move that when the Senate adjourns to-day it be to meet on Monday next.

The motion was agreed to.

EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. CULLOM. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After twenty-three minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened, and (at 4 o'clock and 35 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Monday, February 8, 1904, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATION.

Executive nomination received by the Senate February 5, 1904.

PENSION AGENT.

Andrew T. Wood, of Mount Sterling, Ky., to be pension agent at Louisville, Ky., vice Daniel R. Collier, deceased.

CONFIRMATIONS.

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate February 5, 1904.

SECRETARY OF LEGATION.

William W. Russell, of Maryland, now secretary of the legation at Caracas, Venezuela, to be secretary of the legation of the United States at Panama, Panama.

PROMOTION IN THE NAVY.

Chaplain William T. Helms to have the rank of commander in the Navy from the 1st day of October, 1903.

POSTMASTERS.

CALIFORNIA.

Leonard S. Calkins to be postmaster at Nevada City, in the county of Nevada and State of California.

MISSISSIPPI.

Henry C. Majure to be postmaster at Newton, in the county of Newton and State of Mississippi.

NORTH CAROLINA.

Franklin A. Barkley to be postmaster at Lincolnton, in the county of Lincoln and State of North Carolina.

William J. McDaniel to be postmaster at Rutherfordton, in the county of Rutherford and State of North Carolina.

Robert S. Templeton to be postmaster at Mooresville, in the county of Iredell and State of North Carolina.

NEW JERSEY.

James W. Danser to be postmaster at Freehold, in the county of Monmouth and State of New Jersey.

NEW YORK.

Eugene P. Strong to be postmaster at Bay Shore, in the county of Suffolk and State of New York.

VERMONT.

John Metcalf to be postmaster at Fair Haven, in the county of Rutland and State of Vermont.

TREATY WITH HAITI.

The injunction of secrecy was removed February 5, 1904, from a naturalization treaty between the United States and the Republic of Haiti, signed at Washington on March 22, 1902.

The injunction of secrecy was removed February 5, 1904, from a treaty between the United States and Haiti, signed February 28, 1903, extending the time within which may be effected the exchange of ratifications of the treaty of naturalization between the two countries, signed March 22, 1902.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

FRIDAY, February 5, 1904.

The House met at 12 o'clock m.

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. HENRY N. COUDEN, D. D.

The Journal of yesterday's proceedings was read and approved.

AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 11825) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1905. Pending that motion, Mr. Speaker, I would like to know if I can agree with the gentleman on the other side as to the length of general debate. How many hours does the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. LAMB] desire?

Mr. LAMB. I should think two hours on a side would be sufficient.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Suppose we agree on three hours. I have had no requests for time on this side. I think three hours are ample. I shall not take any time myself. Let us say not to exceed three hours in all.

Mr. LAMB. We would like to have two hours on this side.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Very well, not to exceed four hours, two of which will be under the control of the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. LAMB. Very well.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that general debate may be limited to four hours.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent that general debate may be closed in four hours. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question now is on the motion of the gentleman from New York that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House for the consideration of the agricultural appropriation bill.

The question was taken, and the motion agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 11825, the agricultural appropriation bill, with Mr. POWERS of Maine in the chair.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I shall detain the committee but a few minutes in explaining a few of the salient points of the bill, the increases in salaries, etc. By reference to the report the committee will see that the bill of last year carried a total of \$5,478,160, and this year it carries \$5,711,240, an increase of \$233,080. In making this comparison I paid no attention to the emergency sums for the foot-and-mouth disease and the cotton-boll weevil, which were carried last year in the regular appropriation bill, and the cotton-boll weevil in the deficiency bill this year. The committee will also notice, on the bottom of the first page of the report, that the increase from 1897 to 1903 is from \$3,182,902 to \$5,711,240, an increase of almost \$3,000,000 in seven years. On the following page (page 2) the committee will see the increases by bureaus, and will notice that all along the line the increases have been generous and sufficient to keep the Department in what I call progressive motion.

There are but two increases in the statutory salaries, and these are not made permanent. Five hundred dollars has been added to the salary of the Chief of the Bureau of Animal Industry, and \$500 to the salary of the Chief of the Division of Entomology, but these increases are in the nature of additional compensation only

while the offices are held by the present incumbents. The precedent for that was established some years ago in the case of the First Assistant of the Interior Department. There have been no other increases of salaries. There have been some new places provided for on the statutory rolls, which, as we read the bill under the five-minute rule, I will explain.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask my colleague what salaries these gentlemen get now.

Mr. BURLESON. The Chief of the Division of Entomology gets \$2,750.

Mr. WADSWORTH. The Chief of the Bureau of Animal Industry gets \$4,500, and the Chief of the Division of Entomology gets \$2,750.

Mr. PAYNE. As I understand, the increase in each case is \$500.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Yes, sir; but this increase is to apply only to the present incumbents.

Mr. PAYNE. Are these gentlemen young and in good health?

Mr. WADSWORTH. They are in good, vigorous health. I hope both of them may last a good many years.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Alabama. What is the ground of this increase of salary in the Bureau of Chemistry to \$39,500? Has it any relation to the pure-food bill?

Mr. WADSWORTH. Yes; it is to enable the Secretary of Agriculture to further carry on investigations into adulterated products from abroad; also, to continue the cane-sirup investigations in Georgia, in addition to the general work of the Chemistry Bureau which it has been pursuing for years.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Alabama. Then the legislation in the pure-food bill does have some connection with this?

Mr. WADSWORTH. Oh, yes. That clause in the pure-food bill covering imports from foreign countries is taken bodily from the agricultural appropriation bill, word for word.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Alabama. And is it a fact in this connection that it will be necessary to employ additional chemical assistants?

Mr. WADSWORTH. Yes; we have provided for that. We have given an additional sum of money.

Now, Mr. Chairman, if there are any further questions to be asked, I will endeavor to answer them. If not, I will yield to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. LAMB], reserving the balance of my time.

Mr. LAMB. I yield twenty minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SHEPPARD].

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Chairman, I desire very briefly to address myself to a feature of the agricultural appropriation bill which has been reported by the able chairman of the Agricultural Committee for present consideration.

During the first session of the present Congress I introduced a resolution which had for its principal object the restoration of the original purpose of the Government distribution of seeds. The original aim of the seed distribution, Mr. Chairman, was undoubtedly laudable. The end in view was the ascertainment of the capacity of the soil. It was the desire of the Government to extend material assistance to the producing masses by enabling them to determine the utmost capabilities of the land which gave them nourishment and life.

In order to show the original purpose of the Government seed distribution, I desire to read that section of the law creating the Agricultural Department in 1862 and to show the purpose which inspired the lawmakers of the country in the inauguration of this custom. Section 527 of the Revised Statutes of 1878 reads as follows:

The purchase and distribution of seeds by the Department of Agriculture shall be confined to such seeds as are rare and uncommon to the country or such as can be made more profitable by frequent changes from one part of our country to another.

Now, it is a matter of common knowledge that the distribution of seeds by the Department of Agriculture has departed from this useful and admirable intention. In order to support this statement, I send to the Clerk's desk the report of the Secretary of Agriculture and call attention to that paragraph which deals with the seed distribution. I ask the attention of the House to the language of the Secretary in comparison with the language of the original law, in order to show how completely the present distribution of seeds has departed from the original intention. I ask the Clerk to read.

The Clerk read as follows:

With regard to the securing and distributing of miscellaneous garden and flower seed, the fact remains that this work does not accomplish the ends for which the law was originally framed. There are collected, put up, and distributed now, on Congressional orders, nearly 40,000,000 packets of miscellaneous vegetable and flower seeds each year. These seeds are the best that can be obtained in the market, but from the fact that large numbers of packets are wanted, the seed obtained can be of standard sorts only, such as are to be found everywhere for sale in the open market. As there is very practical object to be gained in distributing this kind of seed, it seems very desirable that some change be made. To this end it would seem wise to limit our work entirely to the securing and distributing of seeds, plants, etc., of

new and rare sorts. There is still much to be done in the way of securing seeds, plants, etc., of this kind from abroad, but still more to be accomplished in careful investigations of our own possibilities in this direction. There are many valuable plants scattered all over this country which are still little known outside of their respective localities. These should be collected, tested, and distributed. There are also great possibilities of improving agricultural industries by distributing specially bred seeds and plants.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Now, Mr. Chairman, the report of the Secretary of Agriculture reveals a condition which demands immediate remedy. The Government of the United States has entered the open markets of the country for the purchase of nearly 40,000,000 packets of standard seeds. These seeds are of the commonest varieties. They are distributed at enormous expense throughout the country, regardless of the character of the soil, the nature of the climate, and the occupation of the inhabitants. They subserve no scientific purpose. They add nothing to the existing knowledge of the soil. When we are told by the Secretary that vast benefit may be accomplished through the distribution of new and untried seeds and plants of native and of foreign origin, it seems almost a crime against the agricultural interests of the country that the useless and wasteful system of the present should be permitted to continue.

I shall dismiss with the contempt it deserves the intimation that the present system is a valuable campaign adjunct and that the seeds are sown that they may flower into myriads of votes. Such an intimation is a reflection on the integrity of Congressmen and the intelligence of their constituencies. I resent the insinuation that any Member of the House owes his seat to the senseless method now in operation.

The American people understand and condemn this practice. Not a farmer is deceived by this pretended kindness. When the regular distribution is made there are no other places in the United States where these packages of seed—these Government chromos in pink and blue—are objects of greater merriment and keener ridicule than the rural post-offices around which the people gather to receive the annual dispensation of free garden seed. When the American Congress shall recognize the fact that there is as much intelligence among the people, as much ability to discover fraud, as within these storied walls, then the standard of American statesmanship will have been infinitely uplifted.

The system is erroneous in principle. It is violative of the proper functions of government; it involves a dangerous philosophy. There is no greater reason for the dissemination of standard seed, bought in the open markets and incapable of developing the possibilities of the soil, than for the gratuitous distribution of any other commodity of ordinary purchase and sale. I desire at this point to present a letter from a constituent which illuminates this proposition:

DEAR SIR: I wish you would send me the seed and other things which I mention below: One peck of some good early corn, 1 bushel of cotton seed, and some good sorghum seed, and a union suit of clothes—a coat 38 in size, and pants 33-34—and anything else you are mind to send me. I am in need of all these things, and they will be gladly received.

[Laughter.]

Now, this gentleman had as complete a right to expect from the United States a suit of clothes, "or anything else," as he expresses it, as the seeds of standard kind. [Applause.]

It is almost universally admitted that the present custom should be changed. It can be made of unlimited value to the American farmer. It has degenerated into a miserable farce, obnoxious alike to Congress and to the people. Let us end it now. If the immense sums now expended for the mere donation of common seed to a favored few could be utilized in the manner so emphatically indicated and so justly desired by the Secretary of Agriculture, the American farmer and the American nation would profit inconceivably. It is a shameful condition of affairs that the agricultural masses, for whom fewer appropriations are made than for any other element of our citizenship, and who contribute most largely to the support of the Government, should be made the profitless beneficiaries of such empty and unpardonable legislation.

With no desire to occupy the rôle of an iconoclast or the attitude of a reformer, I shall offer an amendment at the proper time to the present bill, embodying the change which justice commends and which the Department of Agriculture will indorse. I trust that the amendment will be adopted. For if the current custom of indiscriminate distribution shall indefinitely continue, if this Congressional comedy shall drift into a continuous performance, we shall ultimately be driven to the mournful admission that we are not statesmen, but seedsmen; and it will be in order for some distinguished seedsmen, some sainted hero of a score of memorable distributions, some legislative knight upon whose shield is blazoned a radish in its glory or a turnip in repose, to rise in his place with becoming gravity and move, Mr. Chairman, that the American eagle be taken from the mace and supplanted by a package of vegetable seed as the supreme emblem of the genius, the character, and the principal occupation of American statesmanship. [Laughter and applause.]

The following poem taken from a weekly newspaper in my district will indicate the trend of public sentiment on this question:

THE CONGRESSIONAL GARDEN SEEDS.

The time is at hand when I trustfully look
(How my mind on the prospect feeds)
When the mail comes in for a package or two
Of Congressional garden seeds.
'Tis strange how our "Member" my name recalls,
How he knows my desires and my needs!
'Twould glad him to notice my joy when I get
My Congressional garden seeds.
There's lettuce and onions that tardily sprout,
And "punkins" of several breeds,
And "pa'snips"—I'd scorn 'em except for the fact
They're Congressional garden seeds.
The soil I dig deep, I plant 'em with care,
Perspiration from every pore bleeds,
Then I "shoo" out the hens lest they bring up too soon
My Congressional garden seeds.
Each day to my garden with zeal I repair
And struggle with clods and with weeds,
Till a few straggling sprouts show the germinant strength
Of Congressional garden seeds.
All summer I labor and patiently wait,
Fighting slugs, borers, bugs, centipedes;
And I prune, and I water, I spray the weak shoots
Of Congressional garden seeds.
Though I sing as I gaze at my blistered hands
And my back for a short respite pleads,
Yet for "souvenirs" vainly I look; then I cuss
The Congressional garden seeds.
—Arnold C. Davis in Mount Pleasant (Tex.) Eagle.

[Laughter and applause.]

Mr. CANDLER. I will ask the gentleman if he will not please insert with his remarks the amendment which he proposes to offer in order that we may be advised as to what the provisions of it will be?

Mr. SHEPPARD. Yes; I shall be pleased to do so if we do not reach the matter to-day.

I want to say that this amendment will improve the present distribution of seeds; that it will carry out the original purpose of the law, and that it will provide for the distribution of new, uncommon, and untried seeds, for their special breeding, and for the better development of the agricultural possibilities of the country.

Mr. CANDLER. The gentleman does not wish to be understood, then, as opposing the distribution of seeds to the people?

Mr. SHEPPARD. I am opposed to certain features of the present system.

Mr. CANDLER. You simply want to change the system. You still want the people to have the seeds.

Mr. SHEPPARD. You have stated my position correctly.

Mr. LAMB. I yield thirty minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. BELL].

Mr. BELL of California. Mr. Chairman, I expect to devote the time that has been assigned to me for debate on this bill to the discussion of an amendment which I intend to propose to the bill at the proper time. I shall direct all my remarks to matters that are really germane to this bill. I believe that every Member of this House recognizes the importance of this measure. I believe that every Member of this House is ready to admit that agriculture is the foundation and the strength of the Republic, and that there is no department of this Government with which we should deal with so much generosity as the Department of Agriculture. In suggesting an amendment to this bill, I do not intend thereby to cast any reflection upon the honorable committee that has had this measure under consideration; but I believe that I have personal knowledge of facts and circumstances which, if they had been fully presented to the committee, would have resulted in the change that I now seek to make.

Mr. Chairman, it is my intention to offer an amendment to this bill, upon page 18 thereof, in line 17, inserting the words "forty-seven thousand" instead of "forty thousand dollars" for the purpose of carrying on the pomological investigation of the Department of Agriculture; and further providing that the sum of \$10,000, instead of \$3,000, as now provided by the bill, may be used by the Department for the purpose of cooperating with the experiment station of California in the eradication of the disease of the grape known as the "Anaheim disease."

I do not want to place myself in the position of advocating only the interests of my State, the State of California, for I believe that this is a subject that interests every State in this Union in which fruit is grown or in which the grape is cultivated. While it is true that in California we raise more grapes and make more wine than all of the other States of this Union combined, yet it is a subject that will appeal to every Member upon the floor of this House.

Now, what do we want to do? The Department of Agriculture two years ago went into the State of California and established experimental vineyards for the purpose of discovering some prac-

ticable method of dealing with the phylloxera and Anaheim disease, which have wrought untold ruin and untold suffering upon the people of my State. In that State they have established but two vineyards. They have done splendid work, but that is not enough. The United States viticulturist in the employment of the Department of Agriculture has recently visited California and spent several months in the study of this question, and has made preliminary arrangements for the establishment of seven more experimental stations in that State in order that the great problem might be properly and amply dealt with.

Now, the Department of Agriculture comes to you and says that this is a necessary work, that this work should be carried on in the interest not only of the people of that great State, but in the interest of the entire country. There is no reason why this House should be at all penurious or overeconomical in allowing the Department to carry on this work.

Now, gentlemen, a great many of you do not represent vineyard districts, but I presume that every man on this floor knows something about the wine industry; but I want to tell you that you do not realize the importance of the wine industry of the State of California. The value of the vineyards in that State to-day is estimated at \$38,000,000. There is to-day \$100,000,000 invested in the business in that State. In 1885 a disease took a deadly hold on the vineyards of that State, known as the "phylloxera," and if you gentlemen had lived in that State as I do, if you had witnessed the ruin and destruction that was wrought by that dread disease, you would have no hesitation in giving the money that we now ask for. Now, in the county of Napa, where I have made my home for twenty years, the vineyards were simply wiped out. Those people who had all they possessed destroyed before they could hardly realize it, those men who had built comfortable homes upon lands that they owned, simply became tenants of the banks who were compelled to foreclose their liens. In the counties of Napa and Sonoma, where some six or eight million gallons of wine had been produced annually, the vineyards were simply swept out of existence, and these men who had gone there and built up their little vineyards, hoping in a few years to get their reward, were suddenly left penniless.

Now, the phylloxera was finally met by resistant vines, although there were ten years when that country was reduced almost to poverty in every vineyard section of the State. But no sooner had they planted their resistant stock when another disease came upon the vineyards of California, starting in the southern part of that State, and known as the "Anaheim disease." You gentlemen come in here with tales about the boll weevil and you appeal to us for help, and I am heartily glad that you got what you wanted, but I submit that the boll weevil in the cotton of the South was no worse than the phylloxera and the Anaheim disease in the State of California; and if this great Government of ours can come to your relief, if it can say we will reach out and help you, we will give you a quarter of a million dollars to deal with this great destroyer that is attacking your fields, are you going to say that this State of mine, when it comes to you and asks merely for the sum of \$7,000, shall not receive the aid that has been given freely and generously to other great industries?

You do not know anything about California. I wish I could take you to that State and show you what we have. Why, the report of the United States viticulturist states there is an area in California that is peculiarly adapted to the cultivation of the grape larger than the entire area of France, and yet in the Republic of France they are to-day producing 1,500,000,000 gallons of wine each year, whereas in the State of California we are producing but 23,000,000 gallons.

Now, if you desire to build up that great Commonwealth, if you desire to build up agriculture in the Far West, if you want to give the vineyards of California a fair chance to thrive and to flourish and to grow, if you want that State to become the peer of sunny France, that leads to-day in the production of wine, I say you can well afford to grant these people the few dollars that they now ask.

Go out into the West! Ask yourself as you look out upon the great fertile prairies that have surrendered to the genius of man and have been converted to the good and welfare of this great people—go out into my own State, into all these great Commonwealths that have been carved from that mighty West, and I ask you what has made them great? What has placed it in the power of the farmers west of the Mississippi to pay off their mortgages and deposit their earnings and profits in the local banks and even loan to Wall street? It is agriculture, successful agriculture, good crops.

Do you people in the East think you would prosper as you now prosper; do you think that this country would be as wealthy in the East if it were not for the great domain that lies beyond the father of waters, where its fields have made it what it is? Now, I say that my State, where we stand first in the production of grapes, when we come to you and tell you that these things are

needed, when we ask for but a small sum, when the Secretary of Agriculture, who has given attention to these facts, who has investigated the cost of carrying on this work, when this Department tells you that this sum is necessary to carry on this work successfully, why is it that it can not be given to us? The Secretary placed his estimate with the committee at \$47,000 for carrying on all the pomological investigations, including every kind of fruit, including all viticultural interests, and that estimate has been cut down to \$10,000. I have no complaint to lodge against the committee, but I think they were not aware of what they were doing to my State when they refused to give the Secretary of Agriculture the money that is absolutely necessary to carry on this work.

As I have already said, the two stations we have there already are doing good work; everybody recognizes that fact. This United States viticulturist has paved the way for seven more. Are you going to say that his work shall be for naught? Are you going to say that we must put this off for one year? I say not. Give them the paltry sum they ask; let there be in the State of California nine experiment stations. The two largest are only 10 acres each and the other seven will average 3 or 4 acres, and it is only with these experimental vineyards that these diseases can be properly dealt with. You know that private enterprise will not take hold of this subject. You have already had experience with that; you know that men as individuals, private citizens, will not take up a great public work like that; it requires governmental aid.

The work of the United States is done in conjunction with the work of the State of California. They are laboring together, helping each other, cooperating in a matter of State and national interest. Now, gentlemen, when the time comes, I want to offer this amendment, and I hope the Committee on Agriculture will not object to it. It is a small matter indeed, but it is necessary. The Department thinks it is necessary, our people think it is necessary, and why should it not be granted? We are going along trying to solve this great problem. As I say, if I could but fasten on your minds the losses that have been sustained by the vineyards of California I believe you would unanimously grant all we desire.

Mr. BURLESON. May I ask the gentleman a question?

Mr. BELL of California. Certainly.

Mr. BURLESON. Is it not a fact that a complete remedy for phylloxera has been discovered in France?

Mr. BELL of California. Yes; and we have been planting resistant vines and endeavoring to graft onto the resistant stocks and thus get rid of the phylloxera.

Mr. BURLESON. The amount carried in this bill was partly intended for the experiments about which the gentleman from California has been talking, and what the committee refused was the amount for the experimental shipments in fruit and investigations affecting the fruit trade here and abroad. Such experiments are now being conducted by the fruit growers in the East on their own account and much more satisfactorily than the Government can make them.

Mr. BELL of California. That is partially true. The Secretary of Agriculture asked for \$5,000 for the purpose of making his investigation of the Anaheim disease in the State of California. You have reduced him to \$3,000. I say if you can not give us the \$7,000, give us the \$5,000.

Mr. BURLESON. Is it not a fact that the amount asked for experimenting with the disease has partly been allowed, but the amount that was asked for the purpose of investigating with reference to shipments of fruit and investigations of market conditions affecting the fruit trade here and abroad which are now being carried on by large dealers of fruit on their own account in the East and New England States has been refused?

Mr. BELL of California. I think the gentleman is slightly mistaken. I have looked at the estimates of the Department. I wish to settle it now, because the Secretary has asked for \$5,000 and you have allowed him \$3,000.

Mr. BURLESON. He asked for an allowance of \$10,000, and they have allowed him an increase of \$3,000. As a matter of fact, as I understand it—I may be mistaken—the allowance has been given him for conducting all the experiments relating to the diseases of grape vines in California of which you have spoken. The amount denied him was for the purpose of conducting investigations and experiments with reference to the shipment of fruit, these investigations and experiments being conducted now by the shippers of fruit in New York and New England on their own account. They say that the experiments by the Agricultural Department have been of no particular benefit to them on this particular line. For these reasons the committee refused the increase asked for this purpose.

Mr. BELL of California. Will the gentleman read the estimate of the Secretary of Agriculture for dealing with the Anaheim

disease? I have just come from the committee room, and I found that it was \$5,000. I have talked with Mr. George Hussman, and he says that the work can not be done for less than \$10,000.

Mr. BURLESON. How long have the scientists of the Agricultural Department been investigating the disease of the grapevine referred to by the gentleman?

Mr. BELL of California. For the last two years.

Mr. BURLESON. If that is so, the amount carried in the bill last year provides for the investigations and experiments the gentleman desires. His desires can be met out of the lump sum even without any increase. I mean out of the \$37,000 carried in the bill last year.

Mr. BELL of California. Is it not a fact that the Department of Agriculture estimated \$5,000 for these experiments this year?

Mr. BURLESON. That may be; but for the experiments and investigation last year money was appropriated and is carried in the \$37,000, and in addition to that sum we now give \$3,000.

Mr. BELL of California. I have my information from the United States viticulturist, and I talked with Doctor Galloway this morning and found he had asked for \$5,000 for the purpose of carrying on these investigations. The committee gave him the discretion to expend \$3,000. He may have taken into consideration that he had some moneys that he could use, which, added to the \$5,000, would be sufficient; but he has put his estimate into your committee at \$5,000.

Mr. BURLESON. I think I am safe in assuring the gentleman that there will be no curtailment of these experiments.

Mr. BELL of California. I know that the United States viticulturist believes that the work can not be conducted for less than \$10,000. However, as to that point I am perfectly willing to take the estimate of the Department of Agriculture.

Now, I have just one word more to say, and that is this: I say that for the treatment of this one disease, this Anaheim disease, we should receive at least the amount that the Secretary of Agriculture has estimated. I am willing to rely upon the estimate that is in the hands of the committee. That amount is \$5,000, as I read it this morning, and we should certainly have that amount to deal with this question; but in asking for the entire \$7,000 additional I say we are not asking for anything unfair or unjust; that our industry warrants it. California never yet has come on her knees to the United States Congress and asked for large appropriations. She does not propose to, but if you protect an industry in one section of the country I believe that you should grant some measure of protection to an industry that is almost as important, at least as important to the people of that State as other industries are to other sections of this Union. I think that the bill should be amended, and at the proper time I shall offer that amendment.

Mr. LAMB. Mr. Chairman, I yield twenty minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. LUCKING].

Mr. LUCKING. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, if I can have your intelligent ear for about five or six minutes on a purely business proposition connected with this bill, I shall consider it a very great favor indeed. The Agricultural Department is now engaged in manufacturing and giving away in unlimited quantities to all who may ask for it a certain preparation known as "blackleg vaccine," which is used for the purpose of curing or preventing the disease known as the "blackleg" among animals. In my district, in the city of Detroit, Mich., is located a house which has expended about \$350,000 in getting ready to manufacture and put upon the market this preparation. There are other establishments of the same kind throughout the United States. This house is known as Parke, Davis & Co., and its preparations are sold all over the world. It is the largest house engaged in the manufacture of pharmaceutical products of standard kinds in the world. It employs 275 traveling salesmen, and employs in its plant over 2,000 people.

The Agricultural Department is now manufacturing this blackleg vaccine and giving it away, as I say, in unlimited quantities to any person who may apply for it. Thousands of doses are given away to single individuals, firms, and corporations. Now, it is not my purpose to ask that this business be stopped entirely, but I am going to offer an amendment to this bill limiting the number of doses that shall be given away to any one person, firm, or corporation to 100. The abuse of this is so great as to destroy entirely the business of this concern which has prepared itself at great expense to do the business. The abuse is principally in the far Western States, where the wealthy ranchmen, who are well able to pay for this vaccine to private individuals who are engaged in the business, get from this Bureau all of this vaccine that they choose to ask for. Now, I submit that it is not right that the Government should engage in this business and destroy private enterprise in that direction, and that there is no more justice in the Department manufacturing and giving away in unlimited quantities this product than there would be to do the

same thing with quinine or smallpox vaccine, boots and shoes, or anything else, for that matter. The business was started in the beginning in the Bureau on the idea that it was experimental.

Mr. BURLESON. Right on that point, will the gentleman yield for a moment?

Mr. LUCKING. Yes.

Mr. BURLESON. Is it not a fact that the issuance of this blackleg vaccine by the Department is upon the idea that there is a chance to stamp out blackleg altogether, and that then there will be no necessity for Parke, Davis & Co. or any other firm manufacturing it, or the Government either? If the gentleman will permit me a moment more of his time, I would like to read an extract from the statement of the Secretary made before the Agricultural Committee while they were considering this bill.

Mr. LUCKING. Very well.

Mr. BURLESON. Secretary Wilson says:

Blackleg is a disease that affects young animals, mostly calves; sometimes yearlings, and, very rarely, 2 year olds. The people had great difficulty in getting serum that was powerful enough to treat it. We make it here for probably a tenth of a cent a dose; and we send out, say, a million and a half doses a year, free to the people, and the result is that wherever we send it blackleg is disappearing. We are pushing this work with the theory that if we can prevent blackleg it will die out.

In that same connection he says that blackleg vaccine is made in the laboratories of the Bureau of Animal Industry, which would be maintained anyway, and that, too, at a trifling cost.

Mr. LUCKING. I understand. That is the claim of the Bureau and I was going to state what their claim was when the gentleman interrupted me. I understand that the claim can not be supported. They have made the same claim for years past, and it is my information that blackleg is a disease which ramifies and which will continue from time to time, the same as smallpox or any other disease, and that there is no justification for the position which the Bureau takes in that direction. I submit that it is not fair to private enterprise and that it is not within the legitimate functions of government. In this connection I desire to have read from the Clerk's desk an editorial from the Oil, Paint, and Drug Reporter of the United States, which I am informed is the leading journal in that line. I ask the attention of the committee to that, and at the proper time I shall move to make the amendment suggested.

Mr. BURLESON. Before the gentleman takes his seat I should like to finish the reading of this statement of the Secretary of Agriculture.

Mr. LUCKING. The gentleman will undoubtedly have all the time he wants for any remarks on this bill.

Mr. BURLESON. I want to read this statement now in connection with the gentleman's remarks, so that the whole matter may be thoroughly understood by the House.

Mr. LUCKING. All right.

Mr. BURLESON. Secretary Wilson further says:

We are pushing this work with the theory that if we can prevent blackleg it will die out.

It is the same with rabies. If you muzzle every dog in the District of Columbia and allow no other dog to come in rabies will not come in. You could not do that. The love for the pup is stronger than the love for man, woman, or child in the District of Columbia, and dogs can not be muzzled here. That is the theory on which we are trying to experiment with blackleg, and we are succeeding. The day should come when there will not be a particle of blackleg in the United States.

Mr. BURLESON. As I understand it, Mr. Secretary, these laboratories are maintained by the Bureau of Animal Industry and its manufacture costs a mere trifle.

Secretary WILSON. Yes. Of course we are interfering with the trade, and if we destroy blackleg in cattle we will destroy their trade in blackleg serum altogether. The economic question is whether we should maintain blackleg for the benefit of these manufacturers.

I hope for these reasons, so well stated by the Secretary of Agriculture, that the gentleman will not insist on his amendment.

Mr. LUCKING. That has been the contention of the Bureau for several years past. They could make the same statement, "our theory is so and so," with reference to smallpox or any other disease which springs up from time to time. The question is simply whether we shall maintain that kind of business in a Government bureau. It does not seem to me that it is proper.

Mr. HAY. May I ask the gentleman a question?

Mr. LUCKING. Yes, sir.

Mr. HAY. The gentleman, I believe, represents the city of Detroit?

Mr. LUCKING. Yes, sir; my district is wholly in that city.

Mr. HAY. Then let me ask the gentleman how much has been spent by the Government at the city of Detroit for rivers and harbors within the last ten years?

Mr. LUCKING. I do not know that anything has been spent inside the city limits of Detroit.

Mr. HAY. I mean, of course, for the benefit of that city.

Mr. LUCKING. For the waterways of the Great Lakes I can not tell how much has been spent—perhaps the gentleman can—a great many thousands, no doubt—perhaps millions—for the benefit of a commerce which is the wonder of the world and the special pride of all Americans to-day.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Is not the cattle industry the pride of all Americans? Is not the beef industry of the United States its chief industry?

Mr. LUCKING. It is one of them.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Then it is entitled to as much protection as any other industry.

Mr. LUCKING. Within reasonable limits we have not any objection. We think the quantity of this article distributed by the Department should not exceed 100 doses to any one person, firm, or corporation. We believe that an abuse has grown up in the Department in connection with this matter.

I ask the Clerk to read what I have sent to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

GOVERNMENT MANUFACTURE OF SERUMS.

The annual report of the Chief of the Bureau of Animal Industry of the Department of Agriculture makes some interesting disclosures which lead to the conviction that the Department officials were not sincere in their original announcement that the manufacture and distribution of vaccines and serums would be confined to the scientific demonstration of the value of these remedial agents, and that the commercial production and distribution would be left to private establishments. It appears that instead of leaving the production and distribution to legitimate manufacturing firms the Bureau of Animal Industry has steadily increased the manufacture and free distribution of these products.

In 1892 the Government factory produced and distributed over 1,688,000 doses of blackleg vaccine virus, while during the past fiscal year the amount was increased to over 1,729,000 doses, and this despite the fact that it had been shown that not only many wealthy ranchmen had been supplied with Government vaccine, although amply able to pay for the commercial product, but that ranchers' supply establishments and many veterinary surgeons had been obtaining the Government product free of cost and sold it to cattle owners. The Chief of the Bureau naively remarks that the demand for the preventive remedy continues to increase, and consequently he asks for an increase in the appropriation for the increased manufacture and free distribution of this product. In other words, the Government is asked to increase the appropriation in order to enable the Bureau of Animal Industry to increase its competition with legitimate manufacturers and supply its products to a larger number of cattle owners and to enable supply concerns and veterinarians to reap a richer harvest in selling the product which the Government furnishes free of cost.

This is a case of competition the legitimate manufacturers can not contend against, and should receive the most emphatic condemnation of the lawmakers at Washington. The Government has demonstrated the value of these preventive remedies, and should now leave the manufacture and sale to those who conduct pathological laboratories as commercial enterprises. There is no need for the Government to enter into competition with private enterprise of its citizens in the manufacture of the serums, vaccines, and viruses, as the various private laboratories are able to supply all requirements, and at prices to those requiring them which are neither excessive nor burdensome.

The specious plea that the production at the public expense and free distribution is to benefit only those unable to benefit by these remedial agents does not hold good, and, as we have before shown, these supplies are diverted from their legitimate purpose and the needy are not benefited. As well might the Government engage in the manufacture of quinine or, in fact, almost any commercial product. Determined effort should be made to prevent Congress increasing the appropriation by giving the legislators full information of the working of the Government serum factory and the abuse of the Government's generosity, as well as of the unfair competition with legitimate manufacturers, who are taxed to support this unjust competition.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

The committee informally rose; and Mr. CURRIER having taken the chair as Speaker pro tempore, a message from the Senate, by Mr. PARKINSON, its reading clerk, announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles; in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:

S. 4122. An act to direct the Director of the Census to cooperate with the secretary of state of the State of Michigan in taking the census of manufactures, and for other purposes; and

S. 3916. An act to amend section 2699 of the Revised Statutes, relating to compensation of collectors of customs.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed without amendment joint resolution of the following title:

H. J. Res. 79. Joint resolution for the transportation of Porto Rican teachers to the United States and return.

AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATION BILL.

The committee resumed its session.

Mr. LAMB. I yield fifteen minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. CANDLER].

Mr. CANDLER. Mr. Chairman, I had not expected to submit any remarks at this time in reference to the bill under consideration, and there would be no necessity for doing so but for the speech of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SHEPPARD], to whom we listened a moment ago, in reference to the seed distribution which is yearly made by the Agricultural Department. Somehow or other I feel that whenever anybody strikes a blow at the distribution of the seeds which go to the farmers and laboring men of this country and to the people generally something should be said in reply to any suggestion proposing to reduce this distribution.

The gentleman suggested that the amendment which he proposes to offer would change the system; but he added that he did not desire to be understood as saying that he was opposed to the distribution of valuable, rare, and uncommon seeds to the people, but that he was opposed to the distribution of standard seeds, like the bulk of those which are distributed under the present system.

I am glad that the gentleman expressed himself as favorable to

the distribution of some seed and that he would not favor the discontinuance of seed entirely. If there is any system which will advance this distribution in any way and increase rather than decrease the quantity of seed, I as a friend to the seed distribution would not oppose it, but I would want to be absolutely sure that it did not curtail the distribution now being made under the present law by present methods.

The farmers of this country get less than any other class of people from the Government in return for the expenditures which they are required to make. While we are making very large appropriations for all the other Departments of the Government—and I am opposed to no necessary expenditure to any Department which is for the good of the country or for the advancement of its interests or welfare—yet, while we make these large appropriations for the other Departments of the National Government—very large in proportion to the appropriations made for the Agricultural Department—it seems to me that instead of talking about cutting off the few benefits that the farmers receive at the hands of the Government through this most beneficent Department, we should enlarge the operations of that Department; and instead of reducing the distribution of seeds to the people, I would rather favor seeing it enlarged to such an extent that the requests which come up from all over the country might be readily met by the representatives of the people here on this floor.

The gentleman read a letter which he had received from a constituent of his, in which the writer asked him to send not only some seeds, but also said that he wanted a suit of clothes and one thing or another—I do not at this time remember all the items. Now, while the gentleman read that letter from some constituent who thought the Government was prepared not only to furnish seeds to the people, but was willing and anxious, through its Representatives—of whom there are none more obliging than the gentleman himself—to furnish them with clothes, he did not read to us a single letter or request which he had received from the honest, patriotic farmers of this country, asking in earnestness and seriously that he should send them the seeds to which they are entitled and which they desire to use for the experiments contemplated and intended by the Agricultural Department.

Why, Mr. Chairman, only a moment ago I put my hand in my pocket and found eight or ten letters which I received only this morning. Among them are four requests for seeds, and I dare say the gentleman has received something of the same kind this morning in his mail; if he has not, he will get such letters before the day is passed, and I venture to say he is not only receiving such requests to-day, but almost every day. The people of his district, like the people of other districts, are asking for seed provided for in the last appropriation, an appropriation just like this appropriation.

Here is one I have just received:

ABERDEEN, MISS., February 3, 1904.

Hon. E. S. CANDLER, Jr., Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Please send me some garden seeds.

A simple request, it is true, but one that is entitled to consideration at my hands and at the hands of the Government of the United States.

Here is another one:

FOLLY, LEE COUNTY, MISS., February 3, 1904.

Please send me some garden seeds. I will appreciate it very much if you will also send me a package of flower seeds.

He not only wants the benefits to be derived from the garden seeds, but wants the flower seeds to beautify his home and make it more attractive for the good wife who presides therein.

Here is another one:

STURGIS, MISS., February 3, 1904.

Please send me some cotton seed, and I will appreciate it also if you will send me a package of garden seeds.

Here is another one:

VERONA, MISS., February 3, 1904.

Please send me some flower seed.

A modest request from a most excellent lady. God bless the ladies! They are God's noblest, sweetest, and best gift to man, and I am always delighted to hear from them and to comply with their requests when possible. [Applause.]

I simply read these four, which I find in this small package of letters that I received only a moment ago, to demonstrate the fact that the people of this country want these seeds sent to them, and when we send them we are but responding to the popular demand on the part of the people throughout the United States of America, for I dare say practically every Member of Congress receives similar requests. And if there is any class of people in this country to whose request we ought to respond and to whom we ought always to be glad to listen, it is the farmers who till the soil and who bring about the balance of trade in this country in our favor as against the world. [Applause.]

Mr. BARTLETT. Seventy-one per cent of the foreign export trade of this country in the past year consisted of farm products.

Mr. HILL of Mississippi. Does not this bill provide that the Secretary of Agriculture shall distribute seeds which are fit for the climate and locality in which they are to be planted? And does he not have that requirement in view in making the distribution?

Mr. CANDLER. It does; and it provides that the Agricultural Department shall provide fit and suitable seed for the different sections and localities of the country and distribute exactly the character of seeds which I understand the gentleman from Texas proposes to provide for in his amendment, as well as the varieties now being distributed, which he calls standard seed and which he desires to discontinue and stop.

The bill says:

For the purchase, propagation, testing, and distribution of valuable seeds, bulbs, trees, shrubs, vines, cuttings, and plants.

And further provides—

That the Secretary of Agriculture shall, in the purchase, testing, and distribution of such seeds, get the best seeds he can obtain at public or private sale, and such as shall be suitable for the respective localities to which the same are to be apportioned and in which same are to be distributed, and such seeds shall include a variety of vegetable and flower seeds suitable for planting and culture in the various sections of the United States.

I thank my colleague, Mr. HILL, for that suggestion. And there is no better way, so far as that is concerned, for testing the fitness of the different varieties of seeds for the soil of this country throughout the length and breadth of it than by making an actual test with the seeds themselves by putting them into the soil. You may theorize about it, you may have your ideas, and you may come to your conclusions, but when the seed is planted and you have an actual opportunity to see the product with your own eyes and to enjoy the fruits that result from it, you no longer have to theorize, but you have a real test. Then you can see absolutely and beyond question the benefits to be derived from it and the soil that is suitable to the seed that you have planted therein.

Now, as I stated a moment ago, if there are any people in the United States of America to whom we ought to listen, it is the farmers of this broad land, and I suppose that if I had asked the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SHEPPARD] the question when he was upon the floor—and if I am not correct he can correct me—how many seeds he had sent out to his district, I would not be surprised if he had responded that he sent out his quota allowed to him under the general distribution, and that in addition thereto he went out and in order to supply the requests from his people he secured by his persuasive powers—which are great—all he could of our very kind friends from the cities who had any to spare, and then possibly applied to the Secretary of Agriculture to get an additional amount to send to his constituents.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I will say to the gentleman that I have not used all these methods.

Mr. CANDLER. Well, I have; and it has given me great pleasure to send to my constituents my full quota under the general distribution, and to secure an additional amount, so as to supply promptly the personal requests which have come to me since my quota went out.

Mr. BURLESON. Is that an answer to the proposition of the gentleman from Texas that this practice ought to be abolished?

Mr. CANDLER. Yes; for it shows that the people want these seeds—and in my judgment they ought to have them—and therefore I contend that the practice ought not to be abolished.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I admire the persistence of the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi—

Mr. CANDLER. I did not understand the remark of the gentleman.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I admire the spirit and the purpose of the argument of the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi, and it in no way conflicts with the argument which I have made.

Mr. CANDLER. Is that an answer to my suggestion that the people want the seed sent out and that the distribution each year of seed as heretofore should not be discontinued or abolished?

Mr. SHEPPARD. When I first came to Congress I used almost every possible method of getting as many seeds as I could, and it seemed to me that that was the principal occupation of a new Member.

Mr. CANDLER. That is one of his occupations. You have not lost your ardor in that respect, have you?

Mr. SHEPPARD. No, indeed; but it was through that experience that I began to see the defects of the present system.

Mr. CANDLER. Have you not had numbers and numbers of personal requests for seeds after you have sent out all that you had?

Mr. SHEPPARD. Yes, quite a number; and now I will ask you if you ever received a request from any constituent of yours for articles of clothing or anything of the kind?

Mr. CANDLER. Oh, yes; I received a letter from one gentleman requesting a hat for himself [laughter] and also one for his wife—a man in Mississippi never forgets his wife [great laughter];

but the fact that your constituent asked for some clothes and mine asked for two hats is no reason to abolish the seed distribution or to change the system now in practice.

Now, then, Mr. Chairman, proceeding a little further, because I had just remarked that if there was any class of people in the United States to whom we should listen it was the farmer. Why? Because we find from the report of the Secretary of Agriculture that but for the farmers of the United States during the past year the balance of trade would have been against us and that we are indebted for our progress in the markets of foreign countries absolutely to the farmers of the United States of America. You talk to me about protection that is given to the manufacturers and the protection that is given to the various industries throughout the United States; they have never been able to protect us against the foreign powers or to keep the balance of trade in our favor.

Mr. HAMLIN. Is it not true that the farmers of this country, who have kept the balance of trade in favor of this Government, have been given less appropriations than any other Department of the Government?

Mr. CANDLER. It is true. The appropriation is about \$100,000,000 for the War Department, and I dare say that the appropriations for the Navy Department will be about the same, making, practically, \$200,000,000 for the implements of warfare in a time of peace, and this appropriation is between five and six millions of dollars for the Agricultural Department, the Department of the people who are pursuing their honest labor and toiling to make a living by the sweat of their brows on the farms throughout America.

Mr. SIMS. Does the gentleman know how much money has been expended for seeds during the time that they have been distributed by the Department?

Mr. CANDLER. No, sir; I do not.

Mr. SIMS. Will it altogether exceed the appropriations for the St. Louis fair?

Mr. CANDLER. It might not. I have not had an occasion or the opportunity to investigate that question.

Mr. SIMS. And they are coming here to borrow \$4,600,000 more.

Mr. CANDLER. Oh, yes; I understand they want to borrow that amount for a short time. The money is now loaned to national banks, where it is being used for their interest, and it would be withdrawn from the national banks if the loan is made and loaned to the fair and be put into circulation in the South, where the people would derive some benefit from it; and then in a few months it will be returned from the treasury of the fair to the Treasury of the United States, after being accumulated by the fair from the patronage of the world. And hence the money, or a large portion of it, will be left in the South—and that will do us no harm.

I am advised by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. HAY] that the appropriation for the Navy Department will be about \$95,000,000 for this year, and hence, as I said a moment ago, the appropriations for the War Department and the Navy Department—for these two Departments—will be, in round numbers, \$200,000,000 to provide implements of war in a time of peace, and for the peaceful tillers of the soil of the United States of America we only appropriate, in round numbers, about \$6,000,000. One hundred and ninety-four million dollars less is given for the benefit of the farmers who till the soil; and I assert, without fear of contradiction, that there is no appropriation that is made to any department of the Government that is as valuable to the Government, as useful in the development of our foreign trade and in sustaining our prosperity as the appropriation to the Agricultural Department. [Loud and prolonged applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. LAMB. I yield ten minutes more to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. CANDLER. I sincerely thank my amiable friend from Virginia for his kindness. He can always be depended on to stand by the farmers. Now, I want to call attention to this appropriation for the distribution of the seed. It is, "\$290,000, of which amount not more than \$48,000 shall be expended for labor in the city of Washington, D. C., and \$40,000 to collect and purchase valuable seeds, plants, etc., from foreign countries for experimental tests to be carried on in cooperation with the agricultural experiment stations, and not less than \$202,000 shall be allowed for Congressional distribution;" hence the net appropriation for Congressional distribution of seed by Members of Congress is only \$202,000.

Mr. BOWIE. Only two-thirds of that.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Two hundred and two thousand dollars is for the purchase of seed. Forty-eight thousand can be used for labor, and \$40,000 for purchase of seeds from foreign countries. The gentleman from Mississippi stated the matter correctly.

Mr. CANDLER. I thank the gentleman from New York. Forty-eight thousand for labor and \$40,000 for foreign seed is taken out of the \$290,000, leaving \$202,000 for Congressional distribution, and two-thirds of the seed purchased with that amount goes to the Representatives and Senators to be distributed among the people, and one-third is retained by the Secretary for distribution to be made by him. I am glad, however, to bear testimony to the fact that the distinguished Secretary of Agriculture, who is a farmer himself, is always very accommodating—at least I have found him so—and is always greatly interested in the welfare of the farmers and the development of agriculture in every part of this magnificent country, and hence is always ready to aid Members of Congress in responding to the personal requests of their constituents by supplying them with additional seed, as far as it is possible for him to do so out of the one-third of the seed which is reserved to be distributed by him.

Now, then, I want to call attention to this point in reference to the balance of trade, which has been kept in favor of this country by the farmers. I have the facts and figures, which are contained in a statement made by the Secretary of Agriculture, in which it is shown that we owe absolutely to the farmers the fact that the balance of trade to-day is in our favor.

I read from the last annual report of the Secretary of Agriculture:

The immense exports from the farms of the country lead to an examination of the so-called "balance of trade." This examination reveals what seems to have escaped the attention of the public, and that is that the favorable balance of trade, everything included, is due to the still more favorable balance of trade in the products of the farm.

During the thirteen years 1890-1902 the average annual excess of domestic exports over imports amounted to \$275,000,000, and during the same time the annual average in favor of farm products was \$337,000,000, from which it is apparent that there was an average annual adverse balance of trade in products other than those of the farm amounting to \$62,000,000, which the farmers offset and had left \$275,000,000 to the credit of themselves and the country.

Taking the business of 1903, the comparison is much more favorable to the farmers than during the preceding thirteen-year period, since the value of domestic exports over imports was \$367,000,000, the entire trade being included, while the excess for farm products was \$422,000,000, which was sufficient not only to offset the unfavorable balance of trade of \$56,000,000 in products other than those of the farm, but to leave, as above stated, the enormous favorable balance of \$367,000,000.

During the last fourteen years there was a balance of trade in favor of farm products, without excepting any year, that amounted to \$4,806,000,000. Against this was an adverse balance of trade in products other than those of the farm of \$865,000,000, and the farmers not only canceled this immense obligation, but had enough left to place \$3,940,000,000 to the credit of the nation when the books of international exchange were balanced.

These figures tersely express the immense national reserve-sustaining power of the farmers of the country under present quantities of production. It is the farmers who have paid the foreign bondholders.

To recapitulate, but for the farmers last year there would have been a balance of trade against us of \$56,000,000, but the farmers canceled that and left \$367,000,000 to our credit. But for the farmers in the past fourteen years there would have been the enormous sum of \$865,000,000 against us, but the farmers met that, settled it, and left the marvelous and almost incomprehensible sum of \$3,940,000,000 to the credit of America. The crowning glory of this country is her wonderful agriculture and the amazing results it has accomplished. [Applause.]

It is the farmers who have paid our foreign bondholders and saved this country from peddling out its securities in the markets of the world and changed it from a debtor nation to a creditor nation, and if that be true, and it is a statement that can not be doubted or questioned, am I not correct when I say we owe more to the farmers of America than to any other class of people in all this country, and that instead of abolishing or curtailing the few things that they do receive at the hands of the National Government we ought to enlarge them and give them better opportunities and better benefits and greater favors, if possible, than we have ever given them in the past? [Applause.] Let us give them more seed, aid them in building "good roads," extend rural delivery of the mails as rapidly as possible, build the canal, do everything in our power to build up the agricultural interests of the country and to make the life of the farmer comfortable, profitable, and happy, and thereby render the greatest service possible to all of our constituents, because when you build up the farming interests of the country you build up every other interest in the country. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. SHEPPARD] says if we continue this system we will be known as "seedsmen" rather than "statesmen;" and I may be called a "seedsmen" rather than a "statesman" because I stand here and advocate the distribution of seed to the people, and especially to the farmers; but you may call me what you please, and name me what you may, as long as I stay here, so help me God, I will raise my voice in the farmer's interest and contend for those things which I believe to be for his good, and thereby help him if I can, and by helping him benefit all the people, because to him we owe more in the past, and we are going to owe more in the future, than we owe to any other class of our citizenship. [Great applause.]

It is the farmer who in time of peace brings the balance of trade

to our shores, and it is the farmer who in time of war stands ready to go to the front and bare his breast to defend the country that he loves. It is the farmer's wife who kisses her bright-faced boy good-bye and faces the loneliness, difficulties, and dangers of isolated country life and tells him to go and remain so long as his services are necessary in the defense of his country and for the good of his people. It is she who under like circumstances gives her husband to the same cause, and whether it be in success or in difficulties, whether it be in time of peace or in war, whether it be in prosperity or in great financial crises, it is the farmer to whom we must turn at last for relief, and, thank God, we have never turned to him unless he came to our rescue and furnished the relief which was required. [Applause.]

I applaud the sentiment and the truth expressed by John Trotwood Moore in his work entitled "A Summer's Hymnal," wherein, in substance, he says: The farmer's life is a loyal and patriotic life, sustained by a faithful hand, that has grasped so often the burden of duty and carried it so unselfishly. It is a hard hand, it is true, but it is faithful and honest, and in its rough grip more gentleness dwells, more truth and honor lay, than in many another of softer parts and finer turn. It may be rough, like the roots of the oak, twisted and hardened, gnarled and knotted, in the primal fight for life with the elements of nature. But unbeautiful as it is, it has borne its full burden in the fight of civilization and the battle of the world. It may be misshapen and its joints large from strain and toil, and the veins may run through it like channels of a stream deep cut, and it may be curved in like the turn of a plow handle and deep set like the grip of an ax helve, and deep set and scarred.

But if to-day there comes an upheaval of the earth in the fusion of rock and matter, and this hand, of all earth's civilization, alone leaves its imprint there to be read eons of ages hence by beings of enlightenment and light in the museums of a higher civilization, well may it stand embedded in some kindred block of stone, not to point to the name and lineage of some prehistoric race, but through all the ages of time it would stand as the "Track of duty," the "Emblem of patriotism" in "the Man age of earth." [Prolonged applause.]

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I now yield ten minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BOUTELL].

Mr. BOUTELL. Mr. Chairman, this would seem to be a proper time to call the attention of the House to a slight error in the last annual report of the Commissioner of Internal Revenue. This report is a very able and interesting one, as are all the reports that have been made by the present Commissioner, and the error to which I allude is one so slight that ordinarily it would not be worthy of mention, but it has been used for purposes so serious that I deem it best to call the attention of the House to it, and through the House the attention of the country.

On page 158 of this report appears a table entitled "Receipts under the oleomargarine law during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1903." In that table appears this item: "Collections on oleomargarine imported from foreign countries, \$3,171.16." At the rate of the internal-revenue tax of 15 cents a pound, this would be an internal-revenue tax upon over 21,000 pounds of imported oleomargarine.

On page 160 the Commissioner continues his figures for the months of July, August, and September of the current fiscal year, and in this table appears the item of \$2,708.65 internal-revenue tax collected on imported oleomargarine, at the rate of 15 cents a pound. This would indicate an importation of over 19,000 pounds.

When I came to read this report these figures attracted my attention, figures which show that there were over 40,000 pounds of oleomargarine imported into the port of Chicago during three months, June to August, inclusive, 1903. On imported oleomargarine there is an internal-revenue tax of 15 cents a pound, and on imported oleomargarine there is a customs tax of 6 cents a pound. This would make a total tax of 21 cents a pound on 40,000 pounds of oleomargarine imported and withdrawn from consumption in Chicago in three months.

As I say, these figures seemed so astonishing to me that I made some inquiries, especially to find where this oleomargarine came from, because I happen to know that Chicago is the place where they make the best, the purest, and the sweetest oleomargarine that is turned out anywhere in the world. It is a product which is now considered by all skillful cooks superior to any kind of dairy butter for most forms of cooking and, I may add further, Mr. Chairman, a product for use on the table superior to nine-tenths of the so-called dairy butter. So I was astonished to find that 40,000 pounds of imported oleomargarine came into Chicago in ninety days, and I naturally wondered where it came from.

I made some inquiries at the Bureau of Statistics, but could get no information, as they had no such statistics. The Customs Bureau in the Treasury Department could throw no light on the subject. When the Commissioner of Internal Revenue took the

matter up he found that these items were the result of a simple mistake, as appears from a letter which he sent to me under the date of January 19, 1904, which I will read. It is as follows:

TREASURY DEPARTMENT,
OFFICE OF COMMISSIONER OF INTERNAL REVENUE,
Washington, January 19, 1904.

Hon. H. S. BOUTELL,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

SIR: In regard to your inquiry relative to imported oleomargarine received in the first district of Illinois, as shown by the Commissioner's Annual Report for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1903, pages 158 and 160, you are advised that a letter has this day been received from Collector Hertz, of Chicago, stating that he made no collections on account of imported oleomargarine during the months of June and August, 1903; that during the month of June he collected \$3,171.16 and during the month of August \$2,708.65 on account of oleomargarine taxed at the rate of one-fourth cent per pound; that his report on Form 22 was erroneous, and that the items which should have appeared opposite abstract 20, were dropped one line to abstract 26, which made the collections from oleomargarine at one-fourth cent per pound appear under oleomargarine imported from foreign countries at 15 cents per pound.

Therefore it is clearly shown that no oleomargarine imported from foreign countries was received in the first district of Illinois during the last fiscal year, or during the months of July, August, and September of the present fiscal year.

Respectfully,

J. W. YERKES, Commissioner.

So that this whole story of 40,000 pounds of oleomargarine imported, on which a combined internal-revenue and customs tax of 21 cents a pound was paid, has simply no foundation in truth in it, and was the result of a mere clerical error made by some subordinate who filled out the blank. It would seem hardly worth while to take up the time of the House to call attention to this matter if it had not been made the basis of some very serious representations, both in the press and elsewhere. Of course the two conclusions at once drawn from the fact that such importations took place were these: First, that the present oleomargarine law was a revenue measure, and I think it would astonish the most ardent friends and supporters of this unjust and discriminating law to have it referred to as a revenue measure.

In the second place, this large importation on which had been paid the internal revenue and customs tax would tend to show that the oleomargarine industry must be an industry in which there is a hidden, secret, and enormous profit to warrant the importation of this article and the payment of a tax of 21 cents a pound on it in addition to the transportation and the cost of manufacture. And so these quotations have been used throughout the country as tending to support these two statements.

But the most serious feature of it all was that in the supplemental brief filed by the Government in the pending cases in the Supreme Court to test the constitutionality of the oleomargarine law. On page 24 of the brief these erroneous figures from this report of the Internal Revenue Commissioner were given to the court with these erroneous deductions that naturally were made therefrom that the law was a revenue law and that the oleomargarine industry was enormously profitable.

I may say, Mr. Chairman, that I took occasion to at once call the attention of the Department of Justice to the fact that there was no truth whatever in the items as given in the report, and the Solicitor-General of course at once called the attention of the court to the error which had been contained in their brief.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Alabama. Is it not the truth that the effect of the oleomargarine bill, as passed here by Congress, has been to suppress the industry of oleomargarine to the benefit of the dairy industry?

Mr. BOUTELL. Why, certainly; that was the only object of the bill.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Alabama. That was the intention of the bill?

Mr. BOUTELL. Yes.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Alabama. Using the taxing power to aid one industry to the destruction of another?

Mr. BOUTELL. Yes.

Mr. PERKINS. Has that been the result of the bill?

Mr. BOUTELL. Yes. Almost every oleomargarine factory in this country has been on its last legs for some months, and if this case in the Supreme Court is decided against the manufacturers, it will destroy the industry. I think they have suffered long enough without having to run up against such a mistake as this, used in such a serious way.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. ADAMS of Wisconsin. Will the gentleman permit me to ask him a question?

Mr. BOUTELL. Certainly; if I have the time, I should be glad to have the gentleman ask me anything he wishes.

Mr. LAMB. I will yield the time to the gentleman.

Mr. ADAMS of Wisconsin. The gentleman states that the oleomargarine factories of this country are on their last legs.

Mr. BOUTELL. I understand they are in very serious condition.

Mr. ADAMS of Wisconsin. Is the gentleman aware of the fact that the total oleomargarine production for last year was 72,000,000 pounds?

Mr. BOUTELL. Yes, but that was very much below what it was the year before, I think 50 per cent less than it was two years ago.

Mr. BURLESON. In other words, this pernicious law has accomplished the object it was intended to accomplish?

Mr. BOUTELL. Yes; absolutely.

Mr. BUTLER of Pennsylvania. What was the production of oleomargarine last year?

Mr. BOUTELL. I could not give the exact figures.

Mr. BUTLER of Pennsylvania. How much above 72,000,000 pounds?

Mr. ADAMS of Wisconsin. It was 125,000,000 pounds.

Mr. BUTLER of Pennsylvania. Does the gentleman consider an industry on its last legs when it manufactures 70,000,000 pounds a year?

Mr. BOUTELL. Yes, considering the number of factories and the fact that they made 125,000,000 of pounds the year before.

Mr. BUTLER of Pennsylvania. Well, its legs will be long enough to carry it a good while yet, I think.

Mr. BOUTELL. Not if the present unjust law remains in force.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Does the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. LAMB] want to use any more time? If not, I will move that the general debate be closed and that we now take up the reading of the bill by sections under the five-minute rule.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Chairman, before that is done, I would like to ask the gentleman from New York a question. I would like to know if there is any provision made in this bill which will permit the Secretary of Agriculture to pay for the services rendered by crop reporters in the different States for sending in their reports?

Mr. WADSWORTH. They are not paid in money. They are paid in the way of documents and bulletins and horse books—things of that sort. I presume the gentleman refers to the crop reporters?

Mr. BARTLETT. Yes; I mean the crop reporters.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I understand there is no complaint made by them nor is there any demand on their part that they shall receive anything. It is a voluntary work, and the Government pays them the compliment of sending them documents and bulletins and farm publications generally.

Mr. BARTLETT. I know that the Government up to this time has not been paying them, but I want to know if this bill contains any provision looking to a change in that regard?

Mr. WADSWORTH. It does not.

Mr. BARTLETT. The bill does not do it, and an effort to amend the bill in that respect of course would be enacting new legislation.

Mr. WADSWORTH. It would be subject to the point of order.

Mr. BARTLETT. And the gentleman stands ready to make such a point of order?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I should have to make it.

Mr. BARTLETT. That is all I desire to know about.

Mr. LAMB. Mr. Chairman, I yield twenty minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. MAYNARD].

Mr. MAYNARD. Mr. Chairman, I desire to call attention to the provisions of this bill embraced under the Bureau of Statistics and Salaries on page 42. The report says that this item has been increased \$15,100. I suppose there is no objection on the part of any Member of this House to this provision, but representing, as I do, one of the greatest trucking sections in the United States, I feel it incumbent upon me to call the attention of the Members of the House to this item, so that it may be thoroughly understood and every Member may know the purpose of the increase and the necessity that exists and the claims these crops have for recognition and help by the General Government. The farmer engaged in growing truck produces wealth for the country and is entitled to the same consideration given growers of other important crops.

We are all familiar with the interest the Government takes in the statistical division of the Agricultural Department with reference to crop reports, frost conditions, and acreage, with reference to cotton, wheat, and other important crops raised in the United States. Mr. Chairman, there has been no report upon the subject of tobacco, rice, or trucking crops which are grown in nearly all of the States of the Union. I desire to submit for the consideration of the House a few statistics in relation to the trucking industry that I have gathered from the Agricultural Department through the courtesy of Doctor Corbett.

The trucking industry in the United States is so diverse in its nature, covers such a wide range of crops and climatic conditions that even those engaged in the industry have no adequate conception of its extent and importance. The reports of the last census, however, offer figures which enable us to present in a

brief and concise form an idea of the magnitude of the industry. We are accustomed to look upon the trucking industry as a very small factor in the general agriculture of the country, but compared with the great staples corn, cotton, wheat, oats, orchard fruits, etc., the products of the truck farms take an important position. There are in the United States 5,739,657 farms, which produce crops valued at \$2,910,138,663, of which amount each of the crops listed contributes the amount set opposite it in the table.

Crop.	Acres.	Value.	Value per acre.
Corn	94,916,911	\$828,258,326	\$8.73
Hay and forage	61,691,166	484,256,846	7.85
Cotton	24,275,101	370,708,746	15.27
Wheat	52,588,574	369,945,320	7.03
Vegetables	5,753,191	242,170,148	42.09
Oats	29,539,698	217,088,584	7.35
All fruits		131,423,517	
Truck (alone)		118,255,243	57.35
Orchard fruits		83,751,840	
Tobacco	1,101,483	56,993,003	51.74
Small fruits		25,030,877	
Rye	2,054,292	12,290,540	5.98
Subtropical fruits		8,549,893	

From the foregoing table it will be noted that vegetable crops hold the fifth position in rank among the great sustaining crops of the country. The trucking industry, which is a purely commercial subdivision of this vegetable industry, ranks eighth among the great wealth-producing crops. With the exception of the aggregate value of all fruit crops, the truck industry stands next in value to the cereals and is \$34,000,000 more than the value of the orchard fruits of the country. This industry returns more than twice as much to the nation as the tobacco industry and about fourteen times as much as the subtropical fruits of the country. The reason that the truck business has never been considered one of the important factors in the agriculture of the country is the comparatively small area which it covers in any particular locality. There are in all only 5,753,191 acres devoted to this industry, and for that reason it has not figured largely in the general farm operations of the country, some of which, like corn, cover 94,916,911 acres.

The character of the industry, however, is indicated by the value of the crop per acre. The average value for corn is \$8.73, and for cotton \$15.27, while for truck it is \$57.35, almost four times as much as for cotton and seven times as much as for corn. This explains the rank of the industry and indicates its intensive character. In comparing these figures it must be borne in mind that they represent the average for all sections of the country, all grades of producers, and the whole range of trucking crops. If special crops were to be selected and the returns of the most successful grower made the basis for comparison the differences between the cereals and truck crops would appear still more striking. In many instances corn is made to yield as much as \$60 to \$70 per acre, while truck crops may be made to return as high as \$900 to \$1,000 per acre. Such returns, however, are only obtained under the best of conditions, with intelligent management, both as regards cultivation and marketing.

For purposes of comparison the general averages will be most satisfactory, as they do not represent extreme conditions, but results which can be attained by any skillful and painstaking grower. The figures presented under the head of "truck" by no means represent the commercial standing of the industry. The census reports the total vegetable industry as having a value of \$242,170,148. Of this, truck is allowed \$118,255,243, the market garden \$67,399,348, the family garden \$46,477,087, or a total of \$232,131,678, thus leaving \$10,038,470 as the value of the vegetable crops used by the canneries of the country, which is undoubtedly very close to the true value of the product. Taking, then, the aggregate value of the truck, the market garden, and the cannery crops, we find the wealth production from the growth of vegetables to be \$195,693,061. This makes no account of the \$46,477,087 worth of vegetables grown in family gardens.

If the corn, hay, and other cereal crops were to be measured by the actual amount put upon the market and sold for cash, I dare say the rating of the crops would be still more markedly changed, with the result that the vegetable crop would stand much higher than at present.

As before stated, vegetable crops are staple crops; the products are perishable, but at the same time are necessities. It is therefore impossible for any one section to monopolize the production of all or, in fact, any one of these crops. The maps here presented not only indicate the wide distribution of these crops but emphasize the magnitude and importance of the local production of these crops about the great centers of consumption. This is again emphasized by the fact that the States with the largest consuming capacity are also the greatest producers. There were in 1899 twelve States each of which reported over 175,000 acres de-

voted to vegetable growing, New York State alone growing over 542,000 acres, while Minnesota, with many adverse conditions, devoted 177,138 acres to the industry. Eleven States derived over \$7,500,000 each from the industry.

New York	\$25,768,430
Pennsylvania	15,832,904
Ohio	12,354,407
Illinois	10,346,797
Michigan	11,088,136
Virginia	9,083,274
Mississippi	8,725,502
New Jersey	8,425,596
Wisconsin	8,048,511
Texas	7,677,242
Iowa	7,588,856

With this vast country interested in this wealth-producing crop, I believe it will strike every Member of this House as fitting that this industry should receive at the hands of the General Government the same aid that the production of cereals, cotton, and other crops receives at the hands of the Agricultural Department. For that reason I have offered these few statistics so that Members may be able to appreciate the necessity and claims that these industries, and the trucking industry especially, have for reports of the character now furnished with reference to the other crops of the country. [Applause.]

Mr. WADSWORTH. I now yield to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. HENRY] such time as he may desire to occupy.

Mr. HENRY of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, this general debate upon the agricultural appropriation bill offers a convenient opportunity for remarks explanatory of the operation and effect of the oleomargarine law.

It is now over two years since the Committee on Agriculture reported the so-called "antioleo bill," which, after a long debate and most vigorous opposition in both branches of Congress, became a law May 9, 1902, becoming operative July 1, 1902. Obviously sufficient time has elapsed to fairly indicate the effect of legislation regarded by many as too drastic. The prophecies of failure and disaster uttered upon this floor during the week's discussion which preceded the passage of the bill will be long remembered.

It was alleged that a great industry would be ruined and the manufacture of oleomargarine made unprofitable; whereas results have proven that while the production of a fraudulent article, intended to be clandestinely sold as counterfeit dairy butter, has been curtailed, yet the manufacture of a more legitimate product, usually honestly sold without deception, is still continued.

It was claimed that oleomargarine colored in imitation of yellow butter, if taxed 10 cents per pound, could not be profitably manufactured; yet the last report of the Commissioner of Internal Revenue shows that over 5,000,000 pounds of colored oleomargarine, subject to this high tax, was manufactured and sold during the first fiscal year after the law became operative.

It was said that uncolored oleomargarine could not be sold except in very limited quantities, but the Bureau reports indicate that nearly 70,000,000 pounds were sold in American markets during the last fiscal year, paying a tax of only one-fourth cent per pound, in place of the 2-cent tax formerly levied, and inferentially benefiting consumers to the extent of at least the difference of 1½ cents per pound.

Representatives of live-stock associations and of oleo manufacturers asserted that the price of oleo oil would be largely reduced, to the great and permanent injury of the stock-growing interests of the West; whereas the highest prices ever quoted for oleo oil have been obtained since the enactment of the oleomargarine law.

Gentlemen from the cotton-growing States were alarmed for the cotton-seed oil industry, believing that the consumption of that oil would be diminished, with a consequent reduction in price. But events have shown that cotton-seed oil is used in increasing quantities and at higher prices, its larger use as a slight coloring ingredient being deemed desirable by oleo manufacturers. In fact, almost every contention made by the manufacturers of oleomargarine has been demonstrated to be false or imaginary, while the expectations and claims of the advocates of this timely and wholesome legislation have been realized and justified by well-ascertained results. So that it can now be truthfully said that, after a trial of over a year and a half, despite the efforts of unscrupulous enemies, the anti-oleo law meets the hopes of its friends and merits the approval of all consumers of dairy products, as well as of the great dairy interests of the country.

Under the provisions of section 4 of this act the sale of adulterated butter is effectually prohibited. The manufacture of process or renovated butter is regulated, and the 54,696,651 pounds of this none too desirable article of food sold during the last fiscal year was branded and marketed under the supervision of the Bureau of Internal Revenue.

The report of the Commissioner of Internal Revenue for 1902, the last year the old law was in force, shows that 126,316,427

pounds of oleomargarine were manufactured during the fiscal year ending July 1, 1902. This, together with 722,237 pounds on hand July 1, 1901, made a total production of 127,038,664 pounds. Of this quantity 3,469,199 pounds were exported, leaving 123,569,465 pounds for domestic consumption.

The Commissioner's report for 1903 shows that 5,710,407 pounds of colored oleomargarine, subject to a tax of 10 cents per pound, were manufactured during the fiscal year ending July 1, 1903, together with 67,573,689 pounds of uncolored, paying a tax of one-fourth cent per pound. Of this quantity 3,486,692 pounds were exported, leaving 69,797,404 pounds for domestic consumption, or 54,072,091 pounds less than in the preceding year.

That the production of oleomargarine is gradually decreasing is indicated by the further fact that during the months of July, August, September, October, and November of the present fiscal year there were manufactured 1,425,310 pounds of colored oleomargarine, together with 20,474,748 pounds of uncolored, making a total production for these five months of 21,900,058 pounds, while the quantity produced in the corresponding months of 1902, the first five months after the law became operative, was 1,874,930 pounds of colored and 25,527,207 pounds of uncolored, making a total production of 26,902,117 pounds, or 5,002,059 pounds more than during the first five months of the present fiscal year. The quantity manufactured during the corresponding months in 1901, under the old law and paying a tax of 2 cents per pound, was 43,529,364 pounds, or more than double the present current production.

The licenses issued under the old law in 1902 were: Manufacturers, 35; wholesale dealers, 192; retail dealers, 10,821. The licenses issued in 1903 under the new law were: Manufacturers, 31; wholesale dealers, 398; retail dealers, 26,157, indicating a wider distribution, if not more legitimate sales.

The revenue collected during the last year of the old law was \$2,944,472.46; the amount collected during the first year of the new law, including the tax upon renovated butter, was \$888,181.68, a sum sufficient to defray the cost of Government supervision—all that the friends and framers of the law anticipated or intended.

These statistics are most satisfactory from a dairyman's point of view, inasmuch as presumably this decrease of over 60,000,000 pounds in the production of oleomargarine since the law became operative, in July, 1902, gave place to and made possible the sale of an equal quantity of dairy or creamery butter.

With these facts before us, it may be fairly claimed that the farmers and dairymen of the country have not only been able to market an increased quantity of butter, but have also obtained slightly higher prices, and withal the consuming public have been protected from imposition and have received the article purchased.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I understand from the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. LAMB] that there are no other gentlemen on his side who desire to address the committee; and as I have no further applications for time, I move that we now proceed to the consideration of the bill under the five-minute rule.

The CHAIRMAN. If there be no objection, the Clerk will proceed with the reading of the bill by paragraphs for amendment and debate under the five-minute rule.

There was no objection.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES.

The committee informally rose; and Mr. GROSVENOR having taken the chair as Speaker pro tempore, a message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House of Representatives by Mr. BARNES, one of his secretaries.

AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATION BILL.

The committee resumed its session.

The Clerk read as follows:

General expenses, Bureau of Animal Industry: For carrying out the provisions of the act approved May 29, 1884, establishing the Bureau of Animal Industry, and the act approved August 30, 1890, providing for an inspection of meats and animals, and the provisions of the act approved March 3, 1891, providing for the inspection of live cattle, hogs, and the carcasses and products thereof which are the subjects of interstate and foreign commerce, and for other purposes, and to prescribe rules and regulations for the safe transport and humane treatment of export cattle from the United States to foreign countries, and the amendatory act approved March 2, 1895, providing for the inspection of live cattle, hogs, and the carcasses and products thereof which are the subjects of interstate and foreign commerce, and for other purposes, and also the provisions of the act approved February 2, 1903, to enable the Secretary of Agriculture to more effectually suppress and prevent the spread of contagious and infectious diseases of live stock, and for other purposes: *Provided*, That live horses be entitled to the same inspection as other animals herein named: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of Agriculture may, in his discretion, waive the requirement of a certificate with beef and other products which are exported to countries that do not require such inspection, \$1,200,000; and the Secretary of Agriculture is hereby authorized to use any part of this sum he may deem necessary or expedient, in such manner as he may think best, in the collection of information concerning live stock, dairy, and other animal products, and to prevent the spread of pleuro-pneumonia, blackleg, tuberculosis, sheep scab, glanders or farcy, hog cholera, and other diseases of animals, and for this purpose to employ as many persons in the city of Washington or elsewhere as he may deem necessary, and to expend any part of this sum in the purchase and destruction of diseased or exposed

animals and the quarantine of the same whenever in his judgment it is essential to prevent the spread of pleuro-pneumonia, tuberculosis, or other diseases of animals from one State to another; for improving and maintaining the Bureau Experiment Station at Bethesda, Md.; to establish, improve, and maintain quarantine stations, and to provide proper shelter and equipment for the care of neat cattle, domestic and other animals imported at such ports as may be deemed necessary; for printing and publishing such reports relating to animal industry as he may direct; and the Secretary of Agriculture may use so much of this sum as he deems necessary for promoting the extension and development of foreign markets for dairy and other farm products of the United States, and for suitable transportation of the same; and such products may be bought in open market and disposed of at the discretion of the Secretary of Agriculture, and he is authorized to apply the moneys received from the sales of such products toward the continuation and repetition of such experimental exports; and the Secretary is hereby authorized to rent a suitable building in the District of Columbia, at an annual rental of not exceeding \$1,800, to be used as a laboratory for said Bureau of Animal Industry; and the employees of the Bureau of Animal Industry outside of the city of Washington may hereafter, in the discretion of the Secretary of Agriculture, without additional expense to the Government, be granted leaves of absence not to exceed fifteen days in any one year: *Provided*, That the Secretary of Agriculture may construe the provisions of the act of March 3, 1891, as amended March 2, 1895, for the inspection of live cattle and products thereof, to include dairy products, intended for exportation to any foreign country, and may apply, under rules and regulations to be prescribed by him, the provisions of said act for inspection and certification appropriate for ascertaining the purity and quality of such products, and may cause the same to be so marked, stamped or labeled as to secure their identity and make known in the markets of foreign countries to which they may be sent from the United States their purity, quality, and grade; and all the provisions of said act relating to live cattle and products thereof for export shall apply to dairy products so inspected and certified.

Mr. LUCKING. Mr. Chairman, I offer the amendment which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The amendment was read, as follows:

After the word "another" in line 7, page 12, insert the following words: "Provided, That the Department or Bureau shall not give away to any one person, firm, or corporation more than 100 doses of blackleg vaccine in any one year."

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I shall have to raise the point of order against that that it is entirely new legislation.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is of the opinion that there are many things in this whole paragraph that might be subject to a point of order, but where they are allowed to remain in the bill by unanimous consent, the Chair thinks an amendment like that offered by the gentleman, to perfect the legislation, is not subject to the point of order.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Then I will listen to what the gentleman from Michigan has to say.

Mr. LUCKING. Mr. Chairman, I desire to add but a very few words to what I said this morning relative to the matter of this amendment.

In the first place, I desire the members of the committee to note that it is not proposed to suppress or completely put an end to the manufacture and distribution of blackleg vaccine. The amendment is simply to correct what everybody to whom I have talked privately admits to be a gross abuse, namely, the giving away of this vaccine in unlimited quantities to people who can very well afford to buy it from private sources, and to limit and prevent the destruction of private enterprise, and to stop the Government in a paternal enterprise, which is certainly wrong in principle and without any real benefit.

The point made by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BURLESON] this morning was that this is being used experimentally with the idea of destroying blackleg entirely in this country. That argument has been used for upward of thirteen years, according to the authority that was read from the desk this morning. And a further abuse exists to this extent that it is given away so freely and with so little inquiry and with so little regard to justice that many individuals are engaged in getting it from the Bureau and reselling it to small farmers throughout certain of the States. This is stated upon what appears to be unquestionable authority, and it is not denied in the Bureau that it is given away in unlimited quantities to anybody who chooses to ask for it. Now, this amendment is simply for the purpose of limiting the number of doses to be given to any one person, firm, or corporation in one year to 100 doses, and it does seem to me that if any rancher or other farmer is so wealthy as to own so many animals that he requires more than that number in any one year he ought to be willing to pay something for it.

I submit further that this pretense of doing it in the hope of stamping out the disease is contradicted and overturned by the experience of the last fifteen years. It is wrong in principle for the Government to interfere with private enterprise, and I hope the amendment will be adopted.

Mr. LAMB. Mr. Speaker, this matter was gone over carefully by the committee, as every other item in it was, and upon the very point that has been discussed here by our friend from Michigan [Mr. LUCKING] we interrogated the Secretary of Agriculture. I should like to have the Clerk read his answers to two questions, asked by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BURLESON] and myself.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. LAMB. That leads me to make a new inquiry of you, Mr. Secretary. I have received letters saying the Government is making serum to destroy blackleg, and trying to interfere with private enterprise. I would like to hear from you on that.

Secretary WILSON. Blackleg is a disease that affects young animals, mostly calves; sometimes yearlings, and, very rarely, 2-year-olds. The people had great difficulty in getting serum that was powerful enough to treat it. We make it here for probably a tenth of a cent a dose; and we send out, say a million and a half doses a year, free to the people, and the result is that wherever we send it blackleg is disappearing. We are pushing this work with the theory that if we can prevent blackleg it will die out.

It is the same with rabies. If you muzzle every dog in the District of Columbia, and allow no other dog to come in, rabies will not come in. You could not do that. The love for the pup is stronger than the love for man, woman, or child in the District of Columbia, and dogs can not be muzzled here. That is the theory on which we are trying to experiment with blackleg, and we are succeeding. The day should come when there will not be a particle of blackleg in the United States.

Mr. BURLESON. As I understand it, Mr. Secretary, these laboratories are maintained by the Bureau of Animal Industry and its manufacture costs a mere trifle.

Secretary WILSON. Yes. Of course we are interfering with the trade, and if we destroy blackleg in cattle, we will destroy their trade in blackleg serum altogether. The economic question is whether we should maintain blackleg for the benefit of these manufacturers.

Mr. LAMB. Now, Mr. Chairman, that goes to the root of this matter. The Government is stamping out blackleg just as it did the foot-and-mouth disease, and the committee will see at once that the private business of these gentlemen referred to by the gentleman from Michigan will not be necessary after the Government has succeeded in stamping out this disease.

Mr. LUCKING. May I ask the gentleman a question?

Mr. LAMB. Yes.

Mr. LUCKING. Was not the same argument made thirteen years ago in this House, that you were stamping it out?

Mr. LAMB. I think so. Experience since then has shown that we are stamping it out, and there is the evidence given by the Secretary of Agriculture himself.

Mr. LUCKING. They might say the same thing about smallpox or anything else that they chose to experiment with.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, I hope the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan will not prevail. I do not believe that the number of doses of vaccine given to any one individual should be limited, at least the limit should not be as low as suggested by the gentleman from Michigan. The Secretary of Agriculture very clearly pointed out that the object of the Department in the distribution of this vaccine is to stamp out blackleg; and during the time that this Government has been distributing this vaccine blackleg has very largely diminished and is being gradually stamped out. The stock raisers of my State that I come in contact with, and with whom I correspond in regard to this matter, tell me that the vaccine furnished by private firms can not be depended upon; that, as a matter of fact, the Government vaccine is a specific; that on the other hand the vaccine that they obtain from the local merchants, either by reason of fault in its manufacture or by reason of the fact that it has become stale in the hands of local merchants, very often is of no value whatever, whereas the blackleg vaccine furnished by the Government is always fresh and in every case efficacious. During the time that this vaccine has been furnished by the Government, at least so far as my region is concerned, blackleg has decreased by at least one-half, indicating that, as a matter of fact, the disease is being rapidly stamped out.

Now, the gentleman from Michigan suggests that by reason of this distribution stock raisers, or those pretending to be stock raisers, who apply for the vaccine are using it as an article of merchandise. I want to call the attention of the gentleman and the House to the fact that the vaccine is never furnished except on an application indorsed by a Member of Congress or a Senator, and if the Member indorsing that application will take the pains to satisfy himself, as he should, as to the character of the applicant, there can be no question but what the vaccine will be properly and legitimately used. It has been my practice whenever an application has reached me to assure myself beyond doubt or question as to the character of the applicant and as to the fact of his being the owner of a sufficient number of cattle to require the number of doses he asks for.

Mr. BOWIE. Is it not true that the cost of a dose of this vaccine to the Government is about one-tenth of 1 cent, and that these private manufacturers sell an inferior quality at 50 cents a dose? At any rate a very much larger amount?

Mr. MONDELL. I think that in our country it is sold for 15 cents a dose in small quantities, and 10 to 12 cents a dose in large quantities.

Mr. BOWIE. It is about a hundred times as much.

Mr. MONDELL. The objection is not so much to the price, objectionable as that is, as to the quality of the vaccine obtained from private manufacturers.

Mr. BURLESON. If the gentleman will permit me, is it not a

fact that the drug stores and other places where the vaccine is kept for sale, if they fail to sell out the stock on hand in this year, carry the stock over to next year, and sell it to the stock raisers, and in consequence of that fact they do not get verile vaccine matter?

Mr. MONDELL. I think that is unquestionably true, and probably that is the reason why the vaccine obtained in the localities or in the local stores is often absolutely worthless.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, I very much hope that this amendment will not prevail. I speak for a large section, where the stock-growing interests are large and where the number of people having small stock interests is large. I want to say that in my experience I have had very many requests for the vaccine to which the gentleman from Michigan alludes, and it is true that an application to the Department for this vaccine must bear the indorsement of a Congressman, so that I think I am fairly well informed as to the sources from which the requests come in my section, and thus far the largest single requests I have had has been for fifty doses of blackleg vaccine. I know also that these requests have come in a large majority of instances from people I have personally known to be not the large stockmen or from men who were seeking to get any undue advantage, but from the smaller stock growers and smaller ranchmen. To them this favor from the Government's bounty, while insignificant in cost, is a very important thing. Many of them are somewhat remote from sources of supply, and that which they can obtain locally is often, from no fault of the original manufacturers, inert and valueless.

To obtain easily, quickly, and without expense a reliable supply has been of great assistance to the very ones who most need it. I know that it is very much desired and appreciated when received, and I feel that if the bill were to be amended it should be in the direction of making the distribution of vaccine more, rather than less, general.

I understand also that a further reason for which the Agricultural Department desires to continue this distribution as it has hitherto carried it on is that it is important on account of the protection thereby afforded to interstate commerce to eradicate the disease or to bring it where the Department can control it. The shipping of cattle from one section to another has made the existence of blackleg on the ranges a very serious menace to the stock growers of the whole country.

The interests which are protected from this danger by the distribution of vaccine certainly have a right to demand further consideration, and to check the work now, before its results have been fully accomplished, would be shortsighted in the extreme. As to the statement that vaccine obtained from the Government is sold for private gain, I can not think that this is the case to any considerable extent. Everything in my own experience is to the contrary, and it seems as though this must be a mistake. It seems to me that it is very important, therefore, for these and many other reasons, that this distribution should continue. I hope that the amendment will not prevail.

Mr. LUCKING. Mr. Chairman, if it is not out of order I would like a minute or so to make some comment. Now, the gentleman, I think from Wyoming, suggested that the limitation placed in the proposed amendment was too small, that 100 doses was below what it ought to be, and I would ask him, if he seriously entertains the proposition of the amendment at all, what he would consider a proper limitation?

Mr. MONDELL. Personally, I do not think there should be any limit.

Mr. LUCKING. Very well; then I will not ask anything further. Now, Mr. Chairman, with reference to the quality of the vaccine prepared and sold by private manufacturing institutions of the country, I desire to say that the one house which I mentioned this morning, Parke, Davis & Co., send their preparations all over the civilized world; that no house on this continent stands higher or is more careful in the preparation of its products.

Its products are used all through the Government institutions in very many of its departments, and I wish to protest vigorously against the proposition that the article which is manufactured by the Government is any better than that manufactured by Parke, Davis & Co., and I would like to ask if any gentleman connected with the Agricultural Department has ventured to say that anything of the kind was true or could be true. Furthermore, the departments now are under Government supervision which manufacture privately the blackleg vaccine.

Mr. MONDELL. Will the gentleman yield to me for a moment? I have no desire to criticize unjustly the product of any manufacturing company in the Union, and if the gentleman listened to what I have said, he will recollect that I have stated—

Mr. LUCKING. There were others who stated that, not yourself.

Mr. MONDELL (continuing). That either by reason of fault in manufacturing or by reason of deterioration of the quality of the goods by long storage they certainly did not produce as good results as the Government vaccine.

Mr. LUCKING. Well, now, Mr. Chairman, that suggests the further fact for the consideration of the members of this committee that the United States Government is actually engaged in manufacturing this stuff just as it is ordered from day to day and giving any amount of it to anybody who may choose to ask for it, and it has done that for many years. Now, thirteen years ago, according to the statistics furnished, they were putting forth nearly as much of this as now. It has increased, I think, about 250,000 doses in the last thirteen years, and I submit for the Government to engage in the business after so many years, when it started the business purely as an experiment, and we understood it was an experiment to see what could be done, that it is an enterprise which ought not any longer to continue in the way it is now being conducted. That is all I desire to say.

The question was taken, and the amendment was not agreed to. The Clerk read as follows:

Botanical investigations and experiments: Investigations relating to medicinal, poisonous, fiber, and other economic plants, seeds, and weeds; the collection of plants, traveling expenses, and express and freight charges; for all necessary office fixtures; the purchase of paper and all other necessary supplies, materials, and apparatus; for rent and ordinary repairs of a building for office and laboratory purposes, not to exceed \$3,000; for gas and electric current; for telegraph and telephone service; for the employment of investigators, local and special agents, clerks, assistants, and student scientific aids at an annual salary of \$480 each, and other labor in conducting experiments in the city of Washington and elsewhere; and in collating, digesting, reporting, and illustrating the result of such experiments; subscriptions to and purchase of botanical publications for use in the division; and the preparation, illustration, and publication of reports; to investigate and publish reports upon the useful plants and plant cultures of the tropical territory of the United States, and to investigate, report upon, and introduce other plants promising to be valuable for the tropical territory of the United States, such plants and botanical and agricultural information when secured to be made available for the work of agricultural experiment stations and schools; to investigate the varieties of cereals grown in the United States or suitable for introduction, in order to standardize the naming of varieties as a basis for the experimental work of the State experiment stations, and as an assistance in commercial grading, and to investigate, in cooperation with the Bureau of Chemistry, the cause of deterioration of export grain, particularly in oceanic transit, and devise means of preventing losses from those causes, \$65,000.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, I wish to offer an amendment. The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa offers an amendment which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Insert on page 20, in line 4, after the word "dollars," the following:

"The Secretary of Agriculture is hereby directed to obtain in the open market samples of seeds of grass, clover, or alfalfa, test the same, and if any such seeds are found to be adulterated or misbranded, or any seeds of Canada blue grass (*Poa compressa*) are obtained under any other name than Canada blue grass or *Poa compressa*, to publish the results of the tests together with the names of the persons by whom the seeds were offered for sale."

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer this amendment. It has the approval of the Agricultural Department. It is to protect the purchasers of seeds against the adulteration and misbranding of seeds and to give the Secretary of Agriculture the authority to purchase samples of seeds and test the same and, if found to be adulterated or misbranded, to publish the results of the tests together with the names of persons offering such seed for sale. I will state, also, that this amendment has been carefully considered by the Committee on Agriculture and is authorized by the committee.

Mr. COWHERD. I would like to ask the gentleman a question. I could not catch from the reading at the Clerk's desk exactly what the amendment was. I understand there is a provision which calls for the publication of the names of parties who sold the seed. What is the purpose?

Mr. HAUGEN. That is, after the seed has been found to be adulterated or misbranded.

Mr. COWHERD. Is it intended to get samples of all seeds from everybody engaged in the business in the United States?

Mr. HAUGEN. Oh, no.

Mr. WADSWORTH. When the Department thinks it is necessary.

Mr. HAUGEN. When it is deemed necessary by the Department.

Mr. BURLESON. I will state to the gentleman from Missouri that it is intended to put the public upon notice of who sells these adulterated seeds.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Arlington experimental farm: To enable the Secretary of Agriculture to continue the necessary improvements to establish and maintain a general experimental farm and agricultural station on the Arlington estate, in the State of Virginia, including employment of labor in the city of Washington or elsewhere, and for all necessary fixtures, supplies, material, apparatus, and other expenses, in accordance with the provisions of the act of Congress approved April 18, 1900, entitled "An act to set apart a portion of the Arlington

estate for experimental agricultural purposes, and to place said portion under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of Agriculture and his successors in office," which act shall be construed to confer upon the Secretary of Agriculture and his successors jurisdiction over so much of the Government land in Alexandria County, Va., known as the Arlington estate, as lies east of the public road leading from the Aqueduct Bridge to Alexandria, Va., otherwise called the Georgetown and Alexandria road, and between said road and the Potomac River, containing about 400 acres, with the exception, however, of a strip of land as follows: Commencing at the point where the Georgetown and Alexandria road enters the Arlington estate on the north side, thence along said road 625 yards, thence in a line perpendicular to said road to the Chesapeake and Ohio Canal, thence along said canal to the north line of the reservation, \$15,000.

Mr. RIXEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment. The Clerk read as follows:

On page 23, line 8, strike out the word "fifteen" and insert the word "twenty-five" so that it will read "\$25,000."

Mr. RIXEY. Mr. Chairman, this experimental farm at Arlington is the only experimental farm in the United States that belongs to the Government. It was taken from the War Department in 1900 and turned over to the Agricultural Department for the purpose of an experimental station. It contains from 300 to 400 acres, and the Agricultural Committee of this House is starving it to death. The act under which it was turned over to the Secretary of Agriculture provides:

That the declared purpose of this act is to set apart said tract of land as a general experimental farm in its broadest sense, where all that pertains to agriculture in its several and different branches, including animal industry and horticulture, may be fostered and encouraged, and the practice and science of farming in the United States advanced, promoted, and practically illustrated.

When this property was turned over to the Agricultural Department it presented the appearance which you can imagine it would after forty years of neglect. At one time the Arlington estate was among the most beautiful in Virginia, but it was confiscated in 1861-1865, and from the time it went into the hands of the Government this portion of it, the low ground of the Arlington estate, remained without any cultivation, tillage, or care for forty years. For that length of time it had been an eyesore to that portion of the State of Virginia and to this city. In 1900 it was turned over to the Agricultural Department and the Secretary was instructed to make it an experimental station, so as to be an example for agriculture in the several States of this Union. At that time the land was traversed by deep gullies, overgrown with underbrush and with not a building or a fence upon it. With the small appropriation of \$15,000 the Secretary has gradually gotten the land into condition to proceed with experiments as contemplated by the law of April 18, 1900, but for two years he has appealed in vain to Congress to give him an additional appropriation.

In his last annual report he takes four or five pages of the report urging the importance of a liberal appropriation for this experimental station, and his concluding words are as follows:

The more specialized character of work which each year becomes necessary in the management of the Arlington farm demands a greater expenditure per acre under cultivation, as new and urgent problems are continually presented for solution; and in order that the work now in progress may be completed and that a few of the many new difficulties presented may each year be brought under consideration, it is respectfully recommended that at least \$25,000 be set aside for use at the Arlington farm.

Mr. Chairman, there is now an appropriation by the General Government for aid to the experimental stations in the several States. This is known as the "Hatch fund," and provides for the appropriation of \$15,000 to each of the several States for experimental stations. These stations are under the control of the States and not of the Federal Government. The State of New York supplements the \$15,000 which this Government gives for experimental purposes with \$100,000, and the State of Illinois supplements the \$15,000 by an appropriation of \$70,000, and yet this committee expects the Department of Agriculture to make the Arlington Experiment Station, which is larger than either and the only one owned by the Government, to be properly conducted and developed upon an expenditure of \$15,000.

Mr. PAYNE. Will the gentleman state how much the State of Virginia supplements this appropriation?

Mr. RIXEY. Virginia is not expected to supplement it, but if you will turn it over to the State of Virginia we will duplicate the amount.

Mr. PAYNE. In other words, you will give \$15,000?

Mr. RIXEY. This land is owned entirely by the United States Government and is controlled by the Government. It was bought by the Government, and the State of Virginia has no jurisdiction over it, because it has surrendered its jurisdiction. Why should you expect the State of Virginia to supplement the Government appropriation?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BOWIE. I ask that the gentleman have five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas asks that the gentleman from Virginia have five minutes more. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. RIXEY. Mr. Chairman, I will not take the whole five minutes. I only want a minute or two. Mr. Chairman, speaking for myself, I have been disappointed in the results at the Arlington farm. I had supposed that Congress would have been liberal in its appropriations and have enabled the Secretary to go on with the developments on the lines contemplated in the act of Congress giving him jurisdiction. He says he wants to conduct experiments in agriculture as they are conducted in the States. He wants to show to the States what can be accomplished in agriculture. He is well informed and equipped for the development of the national experimental farm, but he is unable to put up the buildings or to make the experiments unless this appropriation is increased.

I submit that what the Secretary asks for is less than he ought to have. Instead of \$100,000 which New York gives to its experimental stations, this Government only gives fifteen thousand to the only experimental station that it owns. I submit that the amendment ought to be adopted, and that the committee should hereafter deal with this great experimental station in a spirit commensurate with the importance and dignity of the agricultural interests—the greatest industry of our country.

Mr. HEPBURN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the chairman of the committee if in his judgment a mistake has not been made in attempting to establish this experimental farm on the Arlington estate. The Arlington estate was intended, I think, for two purposes originally, neither of them an agricultural purpose, and now, for the uses of the military, they are seeking to secure additional very high-priced land in order that there may be room for the military maneuvers that ought to occur at that place. Has there not been a mistake made in taking the three or four hundred acres that lie down in the flats, admirably adapted for military maneuvers, and attempting to establish this farm at that place? I think so; and I for one would be unwilling that there should be any permanent improvements that will be destroyed when the estate is returned to the real uses for which it was purchased and to which it ought to be dedicated.

Every foot of that land is needed now for the maneuvers of the troops that from time to time will be there and that perhaps ought to be there at all times, and we ought to use that which we have and not pay, as is contemplated by certain real estate firms in this city, five hundred, a thousand, or two thousand dollars an acre for additional land in order to make needed room for military maneuvers.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Chairman, the Committee on Agriculture, I may state, has always been opposed to the establishment of a Government experimental farm. They take the ground that the experiment station in each State and Territory, to which the National Government contributes \$15,000 annually, is sufficient.

In other words, that an experiment made here on the shores of the Potomac would be of no account in the State of Pennsylvania or the State of New York. Therefore, as an experimental farm it has never been popular, I may say, with the Committee on Agriculture.

Mr. HEPBURN. Will the gentleman allow me to say, for fear of being misunderstood, that I do not want to make any criticism upon the policy of the establishment of this national experimental station. I believe in it; I think it ought to be done. I do not agree with the committee on that matter; but I do believe that we have made a mistake in locating it here upon the high-priced lands so near the capital.

Mr. WADSWORTH. In considering this question, Mr. Chairman, the committee simply decided to put this experimental station on all fours with all the other experimental stations of the country. The United States Government gives \$15,000 a year to the experimental stations located in each State and Territory. We have simply treated this United States experimental station exactly as we have treated those in the several States. This station can not be built up, I admit, in one year with \$15,000; but I disagree with the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. RIXEY]. I think great work has been done there already under previous appropriations and the work will continue, and in ten years, with \$150,000 expended there, you will have a magnificent experimental station. And let me say further to the gentleman from Virginia that Virginia is very fortunate in having two stations that the Government gives \$15,000 each to.

There is the State experimental station, and then there is this experimental station. Now, the mere matter of \$10,000 does not amount to very much, but we simply put it on the same ground as we put all the other stations, and, as I say, in ten or fifteen years that station will be a magnificent station with an annual appropriation of \$15,000.

Mr. RIXEY. Does not the State of New York supplement the

\$15,000 which the Government gives by an appropriation of over a hundred thousand dollars?

Mr. WADSWORTH. That is very true. Why does not Virginia do the same?

Mr. RIXEY. Virginia has nothing to do with this station. The policy of establishing it was decided by Congress. Four years ago Congress decided to establish this station and turned it over to the Agricultural Department. In reply to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HEPBURN] I desire simply to state that the Secretary of War reported that he had no use for this portion of the Arlington estate—about 300 acres of land; that the tract contained altogether about twelve hundred, and that the remainder was all that was needed for the military reservation and the national cemetery, and he would be very glad to have the river low grounds transferred to the Secretary of Agriculture. The Military Committee of the House unanimously reported the bill, and it became a law.

I know of no effort on the part of real estate men, as charged by the gentleman from Iowa, to foist upon the Government tracts of land adjacent to this capital for military purposes. So far as I know, this Government has now at the military reservation at Arlington more land than it has any use for. The 400 acres of river bottom land are admirably adapted to experimental purposes. It has been turned over to the Secretary of Agriculture for that purpose, and it seems to me to be the worst kind of economy to say that you will not increase the small appropriation which it now has. If it were put on the same footing as New York, you would give it over \$100,000. The Secretary of Agriculture is, in my judgment, the most conservative member of the Government in submitting his estimates to Congress, and the Committee on Agriculture is the only committee that I know of that does in any way keep down the expenditures of its Department.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Well, the gentleman does not blame us for it, does he?

Mr. RIXEY. Oh, I do not blame the committee, but I think there is such a thing as false economy, and in this particular there is false economy, because you simply give the Secretary enough to keep the experimental farm open, without funds, however, for proper development. Why this economy in agriculture and wasteful extravagance in other Departments?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I deny utterly that statement of the gentleman. A few days ago I passed a day with Professor Galloway, of the Department, in making an inspection of what has been done on this farm. Great improvements have been made there. Fifteen thousand dollars will make still greater improvements, and \$15,000 appropriated next year will continue the work. Rome was not built in a day, and we can not make that experimental station in a day.

Mr. RIXEY. Rome was not built in a day, and if Romulus and Remus had been members of the Agricultural Committee, it never would have been begun. [Laughter.]

Mr. WADSWORTH. That is a matter of ancient history that I will not discuss with the gentleman from Virginia.

The question being taken on the amendment of Mr. RIXEY, it was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Purchase and distribution of valuable seeds: For the purchase, propagation, testing, and distribution of valuable seeds, bulbs, trees, shrubs, vines, cuttings, and plants; for rent of building, not to exceed \$3,000; the employment of local and special agents, clerks, assistants, and other labor required, in the city of Washington and elsewhere; all necessary office fixtures and supplies, fuel, transportation, paper, twine, gum, printing, postal cards, gas, and electric current; traveling expenses, and all necessary material and repairs for putting up and distributing the same, and to be distributed in localities adapted to their culture, \$200,000, of which amount not more than \$48,000 shall be expended for labor in the city of Washington, D. C., and not less than \$202,000 shall be allotted for Congressional distribution.

And the Secretary of Agriculture is hereby directed to expend the said sum, as nearly as practicable, in the purchase, testing, and distribution of such valuable seeds, bulbs, shrubs, vines, cuttings, and plants, the best he can obtain at public or private sale, and such as shall be suitable for the respective localities to which the same are to be apportioned, and in which same are to be distributed as hereinafter stated, and such seeds so purchased shall include a variety of vegetable and flower seeds suitable for planting and culture in the various sections of the United States. An equal proportion of two-thirds, and no more, of all seeds, bulbs, shrubs, vines, cuttings, and plants shall, upon their request, after due notification by the Secretary of Agriculture that the allotment to their respective districts is ready for distribution, be supplied to Senators, Representatives, and Delegates in Congress for distribution among their constituents, or mailed by the Department upon the receipt of their addressed franks; such franks to be furnished by the Public Printer as is now done for document slips with the names of Senators, Members, and Delegates printed thereon, and the words "United States Department of Agriculture, Congressional seed distribution," or such other phraseology as the Secretary may direct; and the person receiving such seeds shall be requested to inform the Department of the results of the experiments therewith: *Provided*, That all seeds, bulbs, plants, and cuttings herein allotted to Senators, Representatives, and Delegates in Congress for distribution remaining uncalled for on the 1st of April shall be distributed by the Secretary of Agriculture, giving preference to those persons whose names and addresses have been furnished by Senators and Representatives in Congress, and who have not before, during the same season, been supplied by the Department: *And provided also*, That the Secretary shall report, as provided in this act, the place, quantity, and price of seeds purchased, and

the date of purchase; but nothing in this paragraph shall be construed to prevent the Secretary of Agriculture from sending seeds to those who apply for the same.

And the amount herein appropriated shall not be diverted or used for any other purpose but for the purchase, propagation, and distribution of valuable seeds, bulbs, shrubs, vines, cuttings, and plants: *Provided, however*, That upon each envelope or wrapper containing packages of seeds the contents thereof shall be plainly indicated, and the Secretary shall not distribute to any Senator, Representative, or Delegate seeds entirely unfit for the climate and locality he represents, but shall distribute the same so that each Member may have seeds of equal value, as near as may be, and the best adapted to the locality he represents: *Provided also*, That the seeds allotted to Senators and Representatives for distribution in the districts embraced within the twenty-fifth and thirty-fourth parallels of latitude shall be ready for delivery not later than the 10th day of January: *Provided further*, That \$40,000 of the sum thus appropriated, or so much thereof as the Secretary of Agriculture shall direct, may be used to collect, purchase, test, propagate, and distribute rare and valuable seeds, bulbs, trees, shrubs, vines, cuttings, and plants from foreign countries for experiments with reference to their introduction into this country; and the seeds, bulbs, trees, shrubs, vines, cuttings, and plants thus collected, purchased, tested, and propagated shall not be included in general distribution, but shall be used for experimental tests to be carried on with the cooperation of the agricultural experiment stations.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Chairman, I desire to make a point of order upon that portion of the paragraph just read, beginning at line 10, page 24, and ending with line 24, page 26. I make this point of order on the ground that the provision embraced within the lines I have specified is a change of existing law and an absolute and mandatory limitation upon the discretion of the Secretary of Agriculture vested in him by the law. May I be heard for a few moments on this point?

The CHAIRMAN. Certainly; the Chair will gladly hear the gentleman on the point of order.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Chairman, the original law on this subject is found in the Revised Statutes of 1878, section 527, which reads as follows:

The purchase and distribution of seeds by the Department of Agriculture shall be confined to such seeds as are rare and uncommon to the country or such as can be made more profitable by frequent changes from one part of the country to another.

Under that provision of law the distribution of seeds is placed within the discretion of the Secretary of Agriculture.

I now desire to read from the Constitution, Manual, and Digest, page 347, the following annotation:

It has been generally held that provisions giving a new construction of law or limiting the discretion which has been exercised by officers charged with the duties of administration are changes of law within the meaning of the rule.

Now, as I understand the matter, certain limitations upon the discretion of an administrative officer are not subject to this point of order, but those limitations apply to the administrative functions of the officer, and they must not be so mandatory as to be equivalent to a direct and substantive enactment of law.

Now, under this paragraph, after the appropriation is provided for as required and authorized by law, the bill proceeds to direct the exact manner in which the Secretary of Agriculture shall conduct the distribution of seeds. Nothing is left to that discretion which has been vested in him by the solemn terms of the law. The paragraph of the bill reads, in part, as follows:

And the Secretary of Agriculture is hereby directed to expend the said sum, as nearly as practicable, in the purchase, testing, and distribution of such valuable seeds, bulbs, shrubs, vines, cuttings, and plants, the best he can obtain at public or private sale, etc.

It will be seen that the language is directly mandatory. The provision proceeds further to state that the distribution shall be made through Congressmen; that blanks shall be furnished by the Public Printer, such as are now furnished as document slips, with the names of Members, Senators, and Delegates printed thereon—a clause for which there is no possible authority in the statutory law, a clause for which there is no possible authorization. And the other clauses of the bill are subject to the same objection and the same criticism.

The bill, proceeding, provides a certain time of the year within which the seeds allotted to certain Senators and Representatives must be distributed. In other words, the bill proceeds, under the guise of an appropriation, to prescribe a new and substantive law—a method by which the Secretary of Agriculture is commanded to proceed with this distribution, allowing nothing to that discretion which is given him by the statute.

I ask for the ruling of the Chair upon this proposition, and afterwards I may desire to offer an amendment to the section.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I do not care to say anything upon the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The question raised by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SHEPPARD] presents some difficulties. The Chair is inclined to construe the bill somewhat as if it read in a little different manner—as if it read thus:

"And the Secretary of Agriculture is hereby directed to expend the said sum, as nearly as practicable, only on the following conditions: For the purpose of testing and distribution," etc.

And while admitting that you can not place a limitation upon

the discretion of the Secretary where the law gives him a right to exercise it, yet construing this paragraph not as a limitation upon his discretion, but rather an addition, and a limitation upon which the appropriation is granted, I shall not sustain the point of order to the whole section, yet there is one provision in the section that the Chair holds to be clearly subject to the point of order. That is that part of the section commencing with the word "such," in line 2, and ending with the word "direct," in line 7, page 25:

Such franks to be furnished by the Public Printer as is now done for document slips with the names of Senators, Members, and Delegates printed thereon, and the words "United States Department of Agriculture, Congressional seed distribution," or such other phraseology as the Secretary may direct.

It seems to the Chair that this is new legislation, and that it is legislation on an appropriation bill, directing what the printing department shall do, and as the Chair understands the rules of the House, that portion of the section being subject to the point of order, it vitiates the whole section. Therefore the Chair sustains the point of order made by the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. WADSWORTH rose and was recognized, and yielded to Mr. SCOTT.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I should like to ask the gentleman from Texas a question.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I understand the point of order has been sustained.

Mr. SCOTT. I desire unanimous consent to say a few words. I should like to direct a suggestion to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SHEPPARD] if he will listen to it. I understand, of course, that his object in raising this point of order is to strike out the whole section, and under the ruling of the Chair that will be done unless the lines which the Chair has just called attention to are stricken out. The gentleman from Texas will readily understand that it will be very easy to submit this paragraph again, eliminating the objectionable lines, so that the purpose of his objection will be defeated; and it will not only be defeated, but the Members of this House will be deprived of the very great benefit conferred upon them in the matter of convenience by the lines stricken out. I wanted to ask the gentleman from Texas, in view of this fact, if he would not be willing to withdraw his point of order, so that these words, by means of which a great convenience is afforded to Members of this House and of the Senate, may still remain in the bill.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Chairman, proceeding by the same unanimous consent which has been given to the gentleman, I desire to say that the object of my entire contention has been to call attention to the irregular, impracticable, and useless manner in which the seed distribution is conducted at present. The object of my argument has never been to secure the entire abolition of the seed distribution which is provided in the law of 1862, establishing the Department of Agriculture; but my object has been simply to improve it and to place it in such a condition that it will be a true test, and will tend to the thorough development of the soil of the country, in accordance with the original intention. After withdrawing the point of order on the statement made by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SCOTT] I shall offer an amendment embodying my ideas, and I trust that they will receive some consideration. My purpose was simply to fix the attention of the House upon the condition of affairs with reference to the seed distribution. Having attained that object, I withdraw the point of order.

Mr. LIND. Mr. Chairman, I renew the point of order. If the Chairman entertains the suggestion of the gentleman from Texas that he can withdraw the point of order after it has been discussed and ruled upon, I certainly—

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will not entertain the suggestion that the point of order can be withdrawn after it has been ruled upon.

Mr. LIND. That it can?

The CHAIRMAN. It can not be withdrawn after the ruling of the Chair.

Mr. SCOTT. Could it be withdrawn by unanimous consent?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will say to the gentleman from Kansas that he thinks the better way would be to ask unanimous consent to offer the whole section as an amendment.

Mr. SCOTT. Then, Mr. Chairman—

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Chairman, the whole section having gone out under the point of order, I have the right to offer a substitute, have I not?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has the right to offer a new section, and he has the right to offer the whole section by unanimous consent.

Mr. WADSWORTH. The entire section?

The CHAIRMAN. By unanimous consent is the only way, the Chair thinks, in which the gentleman could offer the whole section again after it has been struck out.

Mr. LIND. Mr. Chairman, I would like to be heard for just one minute, so as to define my position.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would state to the gentleman from Minnesota there is nothing before the committee.

Mr. LIND. I know there is not. I ask unanimous consent to make a statement, for not to exceed two minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota asks unanimous consent that he may be permitted to speak for two minutes. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. LIND. Mr. Chairman, I want to say for the benefit of the chairman of this committee that I shall feel it my duty to object to unanimous consent for any proposition that involves the continuance of the present miserable, demoralizing habit of sending out seed that has no special value. [Applause.] Now, in every legislative and administrative position that I have filled I have gone as far as any other man to vote and work for the furtherance of every legitimate interest of agriculture, and have been a consistent, active supporter of the agricultural college of our State; and I doubt whether there is a better one in the United States. There may be those as good, but none better. It is doing splendid work. If one-half of the money that is wasted by our delegation from Minnesota in this work of sending out oftentimes worthless seeds were turned into the treasury of our agricultural college, we would be doing twentyfold more good for agriculture than comes from this system.

I think it is time for the membership of this House to rise to the dignity of meeting this question, as well as all other questions, on its merits. Let us take the \$290,000 that we fritter away in this manner and distribute it pro rata among the agricultural colleges of this land, and the benefits to agriculture would be tenfold—aye, a hundredfold—greater.

The original scheme of the law was for the Agricultural Department—at that time we did not have good stations in the several States—to secure and send out new, rare, and valuable foreign seed for experimental purposes. This was legitimate and proper; but now it would be infinitely better to supply such seed to the various agricultural colleges than to have them distributed by Members of Congress. This is not the kind of work that we were elected to do. I am willing to do anything for my constituents, but I do not want to waste their money. I am sending out my quota of seed faithfully. It does not affect seed distribution for this session, but I say we ought to do the right thing, and cut it off for the future. Let us have one year of respite and relief, Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. LIND. I ask unanimous consent that I may have a minute more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota asks unanimous consent that he may have one minute more. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. LIND. I say, Mr. Chairman, let the country have one year's respite, one session's respite from this work, and the membership of this House will enjoy it quite as much as our constituents. Then, if we want to go back to this miserable practice, let us reinstate it. Now we have the opportunity, without requiring individuals to go on record, to do the right thing. Let us embrace and improve this opportunity. That is all I have to say.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN. There is nothing before the committee. The gentleman from Minnesota was speaking by unanimous consent.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. I ask unanimous consent that I may have five minutes.

Mr. FOSTER of Vermont. I object. I want to get something before the House.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I now offer a substitute for the paragraph stricken out on the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I will save time by stating to the House that on page 24, after line 9, I have reinstated that paragraph in detail with the exception of the lines at the top of page 25 commencing with the words "such franks to be furnished by the Public Printer" and ending on line 7 with the word "direct," in conformity to the ruling of the Chair.

Mr. CANDLER. Why does not the gentleman from New York read those words?

Mr. LIND. I object.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has a right to offer the amendment.

Mr. LIND. I make the point of order against the amendment. Mr. BURLESON. Will the gentleman read the words that are to be stricken out?

Mr. WADSWORTH. These are the words, commencing on line 2, page 25:

Such franks to be furnished by the Public Printer as is now done for document slips with the names of Senators, Members, and Delegates printed

thereon, and the words "United States Department of Agriculture, Congressional seed distribution," or such other phraseology as the Secretary may direct.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair understands the gentleman from New York to ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Now I offer this as an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment in the nature of a substitute.

Mr. LIND. And on the amendment I make the point of order.

The Clerk proceeded to read the section.

Mr. BOWIE. I see no use in reading it. I ask unanimous consent that we dispense with the reading, it having been read once.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama asks unanimous consent that the reading of the substitute or amendment be dispensed with. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Chairman, I would like to know whether the amendment offered by the chairman of the committee is identical with the bill as reported.

The CHAIRMAN. No; it is not.

Mr. BOWIE. It strikes out the part subject to the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. If identical, it would have required unanimous consent to offer it.

Mr. LIND. Mr. Chairman, I still reserve the point of order against the amendment offered as being different from existing law on the subject, and on that point I wish to be heard very briefly.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman.

Mr. LIND. The existing law on this subject is found in section 527 of the Revised Statutes. Has the Chair the Revised Statutes, section 527?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair has read it.

Mr. LIND. The Chair will observe that it reads this way:

The purchase and distribution of seeds by the Department of Agriculture shall be confined to such seeds as are rare and uncommon to the country.

It shall be confined to such seeds as are rare and uncommon to the country, and this committee has no power to make an appropriation for a wholesale purchase of any sort or kind of seeds. If the chairman of the committee will offer an amendment of a reasonable amount to be expended in conformity with the section of the statute just read, I shall not object.

Mr. DE ARMOND. Mr. Chairman, it doubtless would be in accord with the spirit of the old law and would be very much better for all concerned if the seeds, plants, bulbs, cuttings, vines, etc., to be distributed were essentially of rare and valuable qualities and largely for the purpose of experimentation and introduction. I take it that under the provision of this bill as it stood and under the law as the law is the Secretary of Agriculture could invest the sum appropriated in securing those rare, valuable, and new things for distribution as the law provides. I take it that this provision as it stood in the first place, or as offered now as an amendment by the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, does not require that the Secretary buy ordinary, cheap, or worthless seeds.

Whatever may be said theoretically about these things, and whether or not abuses may have sprung up, it is also true that many people in the country like to get packages of these seeds and put a value upon them higher, perhaps, than we do here in the House; and when we are dealing with the matter theoretically they deal with it practically. A good many of these seeds they find to be valuable—at least, they conclude they are valuable, and in the use of them by these people they prove so. A great many good varieties of seeds are introduced into neighborhoods where they are well adapted to the needs of the county, and, where once introduced, the seeds remain and are used year after year and perhaps generation after generation.

I believe while there may have been abuses in this matter, better judgment and more care may be exercised in it, and that the reform which knocks out entirely the appropriation is a reform on paper and in theory rather than a real reform, and that it appeals more to our own aesthetic notions than to the views and experiences of our constituents. I believe that if this amendment is to be restored it ought to be restored with the part stricken out in it. I do not know what objection there can be, if the seeds are to be distributed at all, to authorizing the Secretary of Agriculture, at the instance of a Member, to have blank slips prepared, with the Member's frank printed upon them and the name also of his State, if he chooses.

It is a convenience in distribution, and the cost of it is very trivial, and the objection to it is one I can not see. So, if this amendment, as offered by the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, is to be considered before the House with a view of restoring to the bill part of the matter ruled out, I shall offer an amendment to the amendment to restore to it the other part stricken out.

Mr. LIND. If you will let me make a statement I will withdraw the point of order on that if the Chair holds that.

Mr. BOWIE. We want to get—

Mr. DE ARMOND. Now, I desire, Mr. Chairman, if it be in order, to submit an amendment to the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York, the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, to restore to the bill this provision which has just been stricken out.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair desires to state to the gentleman from Missouri that there is a point of order raised against the amendment presented by the gentleman from New York and the Chair thinks another amendment will not be in order until that point of order is decided.

Mr. DE ARMOND. I understood that point would be withdrawn, pending the offering of this amendment. I may be wrong about that.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will rule upon the point of order now, if nothing further—

Mr. DE ARMOND. Mr. Chairman, let me suggest this as to the amendment against which the point of order is made, that, subject to the point of order, if the gentleman will reserve the point of order, I would like to offer an amendment to the amendment, and let the committee consider that if it will.

Mr. LIND. I will say to the Chair that if the Chair should hold that the amendment offered by the chairman of the committee is in order, then I shall withdraw the point of order as to the other portion. If we are to retain this, I want to retain the whole machinery of the bill.

Mr. SHEPPARD. That, Mr. Chairman, was my position exactly in withdrawing the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. As the Chair stated at first, this is a somewhat difficult question to decide, but in the opinion of the Chair the point of order raised by the gentleman from Minnesota against this amendment is not well taken, as a careful reading of the whole section of the statute will show. The Chair will read for the instruction of the House the whole of the section of the statute of which the gentleman from Minnesota read only a part. It is as follows:

SEC. 527. The purchase and distribution of seeds by the Department of Agriculture shall be confined to such seeds as are rare and uncommon to the country, or such as can be made more profitable by frequent changes from one part of our own country to another; and the purchase or propagation and distribution of trees, plants, shrubs, vines, and cuttings shall be confined to such as are adapted to general cultivation and to promote the general interests of horticulture and agriculture throughout the United States.

So the committee will see that the statute is somewhat broader than that part of it which was read by the gentleman from Minnesota. Now, the provisions here in the proposed amendment, the Chair thinks, are not necessarily in conflict with the statute when all of it is considered and its scope and purpose considered. The amendment reads:

And the Secretary of Agriculture is hereby directed to expend the said sum as nearly as practicable in the purchase, testing, and distribution of such valuable seed, bulbs, shrubs, vines, cuttings, and plants, the best he can obtain at public or private sale, and such as shall be suitable for the respective localities to which the same are to be apportioned.

The Chair does not think there is anything in that portion of the amendment which I have read which necessarily changes the original statute, or is it a change of existing law; and the Chair therefore overrules the point of order.

Mr. LIND. Then, Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my point of order as to the whole section. If necessary, I will ask unanimous consent that I may withdraw the point of order.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Chairman, if the House will adopt my amendment, I will ask unanimous consent that the paragraph mentioned by the gentleman from Missouri be reinserted.

Mr. DE ARMOND. I think the better way, Mr. Chairman, to get at that is to offer it as an amendment.

Mr. WADSWORTH. That is immaterial.

Mr. DE ARMOND. If you attempt to do it by unanimous consent it can be defeated by one Member. I offer it as an amendment, to insert in the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York that part of the original paragraph that was eliminated from it.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 25, line 2, insert "such franks to be furnished by the Public Printer as is now done for document slips, with the names of Senators, Members, and Delegates printed thereon, and the words, 'United States Department of Agriculture, Congressional Seed Distribution,' or such other phraseology as the Secretary may direct."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the adoption of the amendment to the amendment.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Mr. Chairman, I disagree very much with the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. LIND] and also with the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SHEPPARD] relative to the benefit of Government seed distribution. These gentlemen have overlooked, it

seems to me, the important element in the distribution of seeds, which is provided for in this section, and that is the transplanting of seeds from one portion of this great country to another. Any person who studies agriculture knows that the transplanting of ordinary seeds from one portion of the country to another, subjecting them to the various influences of climate and soil, is of great benefit and value to agriculture.

Mr. SHEPPARD. My amendment provides for that.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Yes; but it seems to me that the distribution of seeds, as the Government has been doing it, is of great value and should be continued. I want to state an experience that we have had in Colorado in the transplantation of ordinary seed. We grow in Colorado a melon called the Rocky Ford cantaloupe. It was produced by planting the ordinary seed in a different soil and under different conditions and subject to the influence of irrigation. Those seeds produced the finest cantaloupes in the world. They are shipped to the New York market and even to the London market. That transplantation was not only of benefit to the people in Colorado, but also to every State that has grown melons, because these seeds go back to the original place and there a superior melon is produced therefrom to that which was originally grown and from which the seed came. Do gentlemen say that that is not in the interest of the development of agriculture?

There have been other developments along the same lines. When we recognize that the 500 varieties of apples all originally came from the common crab apple, we must acknowledge that the transplanting of common seeds from one part of the world to another is of great value. When we take into consideration that the many varieties of peaches all came from one plant, a bitter plant that was supposed to be poisonous, we find what development is possible from transplantation and cultivation.

Within the last ten or fifteen years we have found great results from the transplanting of seed from one portion of the country with reference to sugar beets.

The quantity of saccharine matter contained in sugar beets has been doubled in the last fifteen years, and why? Because this ordinary seed has been transplanted from one portion of the country to another, development has taken place through cultivation under different climates and soils, and that very seed transplanted back to the original place from which it came has produced much sweeter beets; so that now the quantity of saccharine matter contained in sugar beets is double that which it was fifteen years ago. Is not that of advantage to agriculture? Is not that of immense benefit to the people of this country?

It may be said that this did not occur through Government distribution, but some of it evidently did. The Secretary of Agriculture has been very active in encouraging the transplantation and cultivation in different soils and climates of sugar-beet seed. It has produced great results, and I have no doubt that a large portion of it is due to the fact that it came through Government distribution. But, Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that what these gentlemen are complaining of is not even well founded from their standpoint. The farmers are not ridiculing the distribution of Government seeds. Every Member of Congress receives requests for them. I have never yet received one that indicated ridicule, and I doubt very much whether any Member of Congress has.

The people appreciate the distribution of the seeds, and they are continually reciting in letters to me that they have gotten good results; often, even, that they have preserved the seed grown therefrom, and that they have distributed the same among their neighbors. Is it possible that there is no benefit to agriculture in this? Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that from any standpoint, from the standpoint that we are giving a benefit to the farmer even if it would not produce development in cultivation, is wise, as the farmer does not get a fair distribution of the taxes that he is compelled to pay; and when we take into consideration the other fact that the transplanting and cultivation of these common seeds in various portions of the country produces wonderful development and wonderful benefit to agriculture, it seems to me no one ought to oppose the amendment that is offered. [Applause.]

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, yielding to every other Member of the House his views upon this subject of seed distribution, I commend the spirit that seeks to guard against fraud and speculation in this branch of the service. I am not unmindful that our good Secretary of Agriculture was imposed upon to the extent of many thousands of dollars by seed sharks and looters whose scales were found wanting and who foisted on us and on our constituents false weights and bad seeds. But he seeks to secure good and rare seeds for distribution, and he went after the malefactors in true typical American-farmer fashion and exposed the swindle and made them disgorge. I stand up for the American farmer and want to strengthen the arm of and bear witness to the integrity of our Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. James Wilson, who seeks to bring to its highest efficiency this

system, which within moderate and reasonable bounds is to be commended. In this I think I only state the sentiment of our membership in the House.

This is not the first instance where there has been presented on this floor, nor throughout the country, an objection to the distribution of seeds. I remember a few years ago the metropolitan newspapers of the country took up the subject and by a system of promotion, encouraged and advanced by the seed houses and sellers, Congress was assailed by a flood of articles and by anonymous circulars and postal cards by professional promoters in large cities, who never went out in the country long enough to breathe its honest air, and we were asked in a form indicating that some good housewife had requested to send her a package of hairpins, or a card of buttons under our system of paternalism. In the same form somebody else would ask for rakes and spades and shovels, all unsigned, and the fruit of these hypocritical sentiment promoters.

Others went so far as to ask us for scoop shovels and road scrapers and thrashing machines and traction engines and all manner of farm implements; but at that time they were not thinking of from two to four hundred million to be spent in the isthmian canal for the commerce and shipping interests, a hundred million annually for Army, and a like sum for Navy, and the innumerable millions in all manner of undertakings; they could only see the comparatively few thousands for the encouragement of agriculture. This was the range of their vision and the range of their patriotism; this was the policy of the seed houses of the country who desired to sell to our farmer constituents and did not want the Secretary of Agriculture to advance and promote the farm industry by sending rare seeds to the various sections of the country.

At that time we had a Member who industriously wrote letters to the newspapers, and, prompted somewhat by the fact that he had large seed-selling interests in his district, his letters were molded to invite opposition to seed distribution. He received answers, and studiously throwing out those which did not agree with his notions he saved those to the contrary, and when he made the motion to strike out the seed distribution and argued it elaborately he asked to insert the sea of newspaper statements in his remarks, which was granted; but the House stood for it then by an almost unanimous vote, and that speech and those newspaper articles died away in the echoes and have never appeared to plague him in the agricultural State he represented.

For years this appropriation remained in the agricultural appropriation bill without question. It is producing its benefits throughout the country; we will go far if we heed the advice or the promotion of the various seed-industry interests and deny to the farmer the advantage of securing about the only thing he ever gets.

It is true that the boll-weevil appropriation of some thousands of dollars was for the farmer, and the appropriation to eradicate the foot-and-mouth disease, nearly \$300,000, was for the farmer, but at the same time it was for the consumers as well. Literature is in the same line, but outside of these appropriations, if you come to consider over it in your leisure, you will find that this is about all the American farmer gets out of the paternalism of the Government, while hundreds of millions go into other channels.

Under the rules I shall ask for a division when we come to a vote upon this proposition to see how Congress stands, and that we may then give notice to the country and to those masquerading under the hypocritical pretense of patriotism when they only selfishly look to sell more seed, and thus they may find out whether or not we are decisively in favor of it or against it. [Applause.]

Mr. LIND. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I shall not pursue this any further. I notice that my colleagues want the seeds, and it is well that they should have them; but I want to call attention to one thing that may set our farmer constituents to thinking.

Last year you appropriated \$270,000 for seeds; and I read from the Secretary's report that out of that \$270,000 \$42,000 in round numbers went for expenses, \$48,000 went to the Brown Bag Milling Company, \$1,600 for the purchase of bags, \$16,000 for miscellaneous expenses. Now, when you tell your farmer constituents that you are considering their welfare, and add by way of postscript that for every 5 cents' worth of seeds that you send home it costs the Government, including transportation, something like 20 cents, they may not think that the investment is so very patriotic.

I want to say to my friend from Colorado [Mr. SHAFROTH] that if this point of order had been sustained I should immediately, or whenever we reached the section, have offered an amendment providing that the \$290,000 which it was the design of the committee to devote to this purpose should be added to the appropriation for the agricultural colleges throughout the land. I did not propose to take a cent from the farmer; but I wanted to place the money where it would do the country and the great agricultural interests the most good.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. DE ARMOND].

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is now upon the amendment in the shape of the paragraph as amended upon the motion of the gentleman from New York.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I rise to a parliamentary inquiry. Would not an amendment be now in order?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair apprehends that the gentleman can offer an amendment after this vote.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I desire to amend the pending paragraph, and I understand that after it has been perfected the amendment will not be in order. Consequently I presume this is the time to submit my amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. An amendment to the pending amendment is in order.

Mr. BOWIE. I want to reserve all points of order on this amendment.

Mr. SHEPPARD. My amendment—which I desire to read myself, because I think I can make it more intelligible—proposes to add, after the words "United States," in line 19, page 24, the following:

Provided, That the purchase and distribution of seeds and plants by the Department of Agriculture shall be confined to such seeds as are rare, untried, and uncommon to the country, or such as can be or have been made more useful and more profitable by special breeding, or such seeds and plants as may be improved by transplantation from one part of the country to another.

Now, Mr. Chairman, on that amendment—

Mr. BOWIE. I wish to make a point of order on the gentleman's amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman from Texas please send his amendment to the desk, so it may be read for the information of the committee?

Mr. BOWIE. I have not the slightest objection to the gentleman discussing his amendment, provided the point of order is not waived. Mr. Chairman, I simply want the point of order reserved in such a way that it will not be lost. If the gentleman from Texas can proceed to discuss his proposition without the point of order being waived, I have no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order having been reserved by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BOWIE], the gentleman from Texas is at liberty to proceed to discuss his amendment after it has been read.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Am I in order now for a few words of explanation?

The CHAIRMAN. The amendment of the gentleman from Texas will be read.

The amendment of Mr. SHEPPARD, as already read by him, was read by the Clerk.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Now, Mr. Chairman, I do not deny, nor have I ever denied—

Mr. HEPBURN. Mr. Chairman, I ask for the regular order.

The CHAIRMAN. The regular order is the point of order raised by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BOWIE] against this amendment.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I take it that I have the right to speak on the amendment.

Mr. SMITH of Kentucky. I understand that the gentleman from Alabama reserved the point of order; he did not actually make it.

Mr. BOWIE. I will give the gentleman unanimous consent, as far as I am concerned.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I regret very much that I have encountered the objection of the distinguished gentleman from Iowa. Am I in order, Mr. Chairman?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is in order to discuss the point of order.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I have not denied the advantage of the Government distribution of seeds. My entire object has been to restore the original purpose of the distribution, the purpose which inspired the lawmakers of the country in the institution of the custom. My amendment follows almost absolutely the language of the organic law which creates the Department of Agriculture.

The gentleman has spoken of the advantages of transplantation. I do not deny them, and in that sense the present system, perhaps, is advantageous; but the fundamental vice of the present system lies in the fact that the Government of the United States enters into the open markets of the country as an ordinary purchaser of standard seeds of common character, whose qualities are already known and thoroughly established throughout the country. Consequently they contribute nothing to the scientific knowledge of the country. There can be absolutely no useful purpose subserved beyond the mere temporary sensation of pleasure which some few men may feel on receiving a communication from the Government.

Mr. THAYER. Mr. Chairman, I should like to ask the gentleman a question, if he is willing.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Certainly.

Mr. THAYER. I should like to know what seeds, bulbs, shrubs, vines, etc., that are now distributed would be excluded if the gentleman's amendment prevailed.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Well, we will say navy beans, for example.

Mr. THAYER. If they are grown in Texas and are replanted in Massachusetts, would you not have a right to do that under the statute as it is now?

Mr. SHEPPARD. If they can be improved by the transplantation.

Mr. THAYER. Who is to be the judge before you transplant them?

Mr. SHEPPARD. The Secretary of Agriculture, as he is the judge now.

Mr. THAYER. Then would he exclude them?

Mr. SHEPPARD. Let me read the original language of the law, in order to make my position plain. This is the creative law with reference to this seed distribution:

The purchase and distribution of seeds by the Department of Agriculture shall be confined to such seeds as are rare and uncommon in the country or such as can be made profitable by frequent changes from one part of our own country to another.

My amendment follows also the recommendations of the distinguished Secretary of Agriculture in his last report. Now, the Secretary of Agriculture himself states that the present seed distribution has departed absolutely from the original purpose; that it no longer subserves a scientific end. My object is simply to provide for the distribution of useful seeds, a distribution which will subserve a useful end.

The CHAIRMAN. Is the gentleman from Texas speaking to the point of order or to the merits of his proposition?

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Chairman, I understood that my amendment was in order.

The CHAIRMAN. It has not yet been ruled upon.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I understood that the point of order was reserved.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HEPBURN] asked for the regular order, which is the discussion of the point of order made by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BOWIE].

Mr. SHEPPARD. I will continue on the point of order and shall take up but very few minutes of the time of the House. I have not stood for the abolition of the distribution of seeds. It is provided for in the organic law, and if properly conducted it is of immense benefit to the agricultural masses of the country. But it is an insult to the agricultural masses to send to them at their expense seeds which play absolutely no part in determining the capabilities of the soil.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is not discussing the point of order, and a demand has been made for the regular order.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Very well, Mr. Chairman, my views are before the House; but as I wish my remarks to be symmetrical and connected, I should like by unanimous consent to be allowed to conclude now.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman be allowed five minutes.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I suggest to the gentleman that he obtain unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I appreciate the implied compliment of the distinguished gentleman from New York.

Mr. SHAFROTH. I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman be allowed three minutes in which to conclude his remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Colorado asks unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas be allowed three minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I ask for the regular order.

The CHAIRMAN. The regular order is demanded. The Chair is ready to rule upon this amendment. If the Chair has made no mistake, it is a verbatim copy of the law as it now exists. That being the case, it has been held that while it is unnecessary, and perhaps almost not good form, yet it is not strictly subject to a point of order. It is simply reenacting a portion of the United States Statutes.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Now I ask for a vote upon the amendment of the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. SHEPPARD. One or two words in further explanation of my amendment, which is now in order.

Mr. WADSWORTH. If the gentleman will pardon me—

Mr. SHEPPARD. Have I the permission of the gentleman to proceed?

Mr. WADSWORTH. How much time does the gentleman want? I move that all debate on this amendment and amendments thereto be closed in five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York moves that

all debate on the amendment and amendments thereto be closed in five minutes.

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Several MEMBERS. Division!

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 92, noes 32.

So the motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Chairman, I do not desire to occupy the time of the House very much further. I think that my position has been made plain. My idea is to improve and not to destroy the seed distribution, to restore its original character, to give it a scientific direction; in other words, to be fair with the American people. I have heard the statement here that this is perhaps the only thing that the farmer receives from the Government. If it is, it is certainly a humiliating condition that the only thing which the farmer receives from the Government is of so little practical benefit. I am sure that this amendment of mine puts into effect no revolutionary change. It meets the desires of the gentleman from Colorado; it meets the argument of every gentleman who has risen upon this subject.

Mr. BOWIE. Will the gentleman allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. SHEPPARD. Certainly.

Mr. BOWIE. I want to know how much benefit the gentleman's amendment will be to the law, if it is already the law, and the fact that it is the law is the reason why the amendment is ruled to be in order.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I understand that the appropriation bill, being subject to the point of order, which I, in a spirit of fairness that has not been reciprocated on the other side, withdrew, is an absolute outrage upon the original purpose of the distribution. This amendment will enable the appropriation to be of greater use to our constituents, and will enable Members to send to them seeds and plants which will determine the possibilities of the soil.

This was the original purpose of the seed distribution, a purpose which, although it may not be adopted to-day, will in the tide of the years be finally restored by Congress. There were three votes in the Committee on Agriculture against the present system. I congratulate the committee upon that fact, and while this amendment may be defeated now, the fact that the Government is going into the open market and buying indiscriminate amounts of standard seeds may lead to scandal. Already an investigation has been placed on foot by the gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD], but in some way it has been smothered. The object of my amendment is that this distribution may be placed on a scientific basis, in the hope that it may be so arranged that it will result in real value to the people. In that spirit I have offered this amendment.

Mr. CANDLER. Mr. Chairman—

Mr. WADSWORTH. What time is left?

The CHAIRMAN. The time has all expired. [Laughter.]

Mr. CANDLER. I was watching the clock, and I thought there were two minutes left.

Mr. GROSVENOR and others. Regular order!

Mr. CANDLER. We ought not to take two minutes away from the farmer. [Laughter and cries of "Vote!"]

Mr. ADAMS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I desire to make an inquiry in reference to this motion or this amendment. I make the parliamentary inquiry as to whether the amendment is drawn in such a form that it is a substitute or whether it is simply an insertion in the substitute?

Mr. PAYNE. It is an insertion.

The CHAIRMAN. It is the insertion, as an amendment to the amendment of the gentleman from New York, of a section of the Revised Statutes. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas to the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York.

The question was taken, and the amendment to the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question now is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York, as amended.

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. I call for a division.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 122, noes 3.

So the amendment as amended was agreed to.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

The committee informally rose; and Mr. HEPBURN having taken the chair as Speaker pro tempore, a message from the Senate, by Mr. PARKINSON, its reading clerk, announced that the Senate had passed with amendments bill of the following title in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:

H. R. 10954. An act making appropriations to supply urgent

deficiencies in the appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1904, and for prior years, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bill of the following title; in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:

S. 3800. An act donating gun carriages to the Connecticut commissioners for the care and preservation of Fort Griswold.

AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATION BILL.

The committee resumed its session.

The Clerk read as follows:

General expenses, Bureau of Forestry: To enable the Secretary of Agriculture to experiment and to make and continue investigations and report on forestry, forest reserves, forest fires, and lumbering; to advise the owners of woodlands as to the proper care of the same; to investigate and test American timber and timber trees; to seek, through investigations and the planting of native and foreign species, suitable trees for the treeless regions, including the erection of the necessary buildings; to collect and distribute valuable economic forest-tree seeds and plants; for the employment of local and special agents, clerks, assistants, and other labor required in practical forestry and in conducting experiments and investigations in the city of Washington and elsewhere, and for collating, digesting, reporting, illustrating, and printing the results of such experiments and investigations; for the purchase of all necessary supplies, apparatus, and office fixtures; for freight and express charges, and traveling and other necessary expenses, \$363,000, of which sum not to exceed \$15,500 may be used for rent. And the employees of the Bureau of Forestry outside of the city of Washington may, in the discretion of the Secretary of Agriculture, without additional expense to the Government, be granted leaves of absence not to exceed fifteen days in any one year.

Mr. HEMENWAY. Mr. Chairman, on page 28, in line 14, after the word "buildings," I desire to offer the following amendment:

Provided, That the cost of any building erected shall not exceed \$500.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 28, in line 14, after the word "buildings," insert "Provided, That the cost of any building erected shall not exceed \$500."

Mr. WADSWORTH. I accept the amendment, Mr. Chairman.

The question was taken and the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

General expenses of entomological investigations: Promotion of economic entomology; investigating the history and habits of insects injurious and beneficial to agriculture, horticulture, and arboriculture; ascertaining the best means of destroying those found to be injurious, including an investigation into the ravages of the codling moth and of the cotton-boll weevil and boll worm, with a view of ascertaining the best methods of their extermination; investigations in apiculture; investigations of the damage to forests and forest trees by insects; purchase of chemicals, insecticide apparatus, and other materials, supplies, and instruments required in conducting such experiments and investigations; for the employment of local and special agents, clerks, assistants, and other labor required in conducting experiments in the city of Washington and elsewhere, and in collating, digesting, reporting, and illustrating the results of such experiments; freight and express charges, and necessary traveling expenses; rent of building; for office fixtures and supplies, telegraph and telephone services; gas and electric current; preparing, illustrating, and publishing the results of the work of the division, \$12,000 of which shall be immediately available, \$65,500, of which amount not to exceed \$10,000 may, in the discretion of the Secretary of Agriculture, be expended for silk investigations.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment to offer on that paragraph. In line 2, after the word "insects," I offer this amendment:

Investigation of the loco plant to find a means for its destruction.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 37, in line 2, after the word "insects," insert "investigation of the loco plant to find a means for its destruction."

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Chairman, that would come under the Bureau of Plant Industry and not under the Bureau of Entomology.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. I find just ahead of that, "Investigations of the damage to forests and forest trees by insects." But if you say it comes under that head, I will wait and offer the amendment then. The loco plant, I may state, is a poisonous plant which is very destructive to horses and cattle, and it is spreading very rapidly in the cattle-growing regions of the United States, and has caused the loss of hundreds of thousands of dollars to the cattle raisers and also to the raisers of horses.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I would say to the gentleman from Texas that is already provided for on page 18, in line 23, under the head of "Botanical investigations and experiments: Investigations relating to medicinal, poisonous, fiber, and other economic plants, seeds, and weeds." Loco is a poisonous plant and comes under that class, and the Department is probably making investigations along that line.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. If the gentleman thinks it is sufficient—

Mr. WADSWORTH. I do.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. I will withdraw the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

General expenses, Bureau of Statistics: Collecting domestic and foreign agricultural statistics, compiling, writing, and illustrating statistical matter for monthly, annual, and special reports; special investigations and compilations;

subscription to, and purchase of, statistical and newspaper publications containing data for permanent comparative records; maps and charts; stationery, office supplies, blanks, blank books, circulars, paper, envelopes, postal cards, postage stamps, office fixtures, telegraph and telephone services, freight and express charges, including employment of labor in the city of Washington and elsewhere, and necessary traveling expenses: *Provided*, That the monthly crop reports issued on the 3d and 10th days of each month shall embrace statements of the conditions of the crops by States in the United States, with such explanations, comparisons, and information as may be useful for illustrating the above matter, and that it shall be submitted to and officially approved by the Secretary of Agriculture before being issued or published, \$122,500, of which not more than \$50,000 shall be expended for salaries in the city of Washington, D. C.

Investigations concerning the feasibility of extending the demands of foreign markets for the agricultural products of the United States, and to secure as far as may be a change in the methods of supplying farm products to foreign countries; employment of local and special agents, clerks, assistants, and other labor required in making investigations in the city of Washington and elsewhere, and in collating, digesting, reporting, and illustrating the results of such investigations; traveling expenses, and freight and express charges; telephone and telegraph services; and all necessary office fixtures and supplies, \$7,500.

Total for Bureau of Statistics, \$187,760.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Georgia offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend by adding in line 11, page 43, at the end of said line, the following: "To pay observers who make statistical reports to the Bureau of Statistics of the condition of crops, and which are used in making up the monthly crop reports herein provided, \$100,000, or so much thereof as is necessary."

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I will have to raise the point of order on that. It is new legislation and increases expenditures.

Mr. BARTLETT. Do I understand the gentleman from New York—I did not hear him—makes the point of order?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I make the point of order that it is new legislation and increases expenditures.

Mr. BARTLETT. Well, Mr. Chairman, I am willing to confess that the point of order occurs to me to be good, but I was in hopes that the gentleman would not make it, at least yet—

Mr. WADSWORTH. I think the gentlemen are sufficiently rewarded with the public documents they received. There has been no complaint from them or any call for money.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Chairman, I do not desire to violate any rule by speaking to the amendment while the point of order is up, but if the gentleman will permit me to say, while he reserves the point of order—

Mr. WADSWORTH. I will do that.

Mr. BARTLETT. I will not detain the House but a moment. This amendment, which I frankly confess is subject to the point of order, was made for the purpose of paying the gentlemen who are observers, who furnish the data for the Secretary of Agriculture upon which he bases his monthly report.

Mr. SCOTT. Will the gentleman permit a question?

Mr. BARTLETT. Yes.

Mr. SCOTT. Does the gentleman know the Secretary of Agriculture prefers not to have these men paid; that he made a statement before the committee that he would rather not pay them even if the money was appropriated?

Mr. BARTLETT. I did not know that, nor does that alter my view about it, with all due regard to the Secretary of Agriculture, for whom I have a very great respect and personal regard. I know this, that I have letters from one of those very competent gentlemen in my district, in which he stated that the Secretary had written him that he thought they ought to be paid and that effort would be made on this bill to provide for such payment. That is all I know about that. Now, the gentleman is correct when he states that the Secretary of Agriculture made that statement before the committee, but I am also correct in making the statement I have referred to as to what one of these gentlemen engaged in this business told me. I have a letter from him.

Mr. SCOTT. I will simply say that the Secretary stated to the committee that he thought he got better service on account of the fact that the services rendered were wholly voluntary; that the men who rendered it had pride in it and gave it better attention than if they were paid for it, and it eliminated also the idea of political patronage, so that the observers who served the Department in this respect were men of better grade than were likely to be obtained if it was a matter of salary.

Mr. BARTLETT. I do not think so, Mr. Chairman. These reports made by the voluntary observers are the most important basis upon which the Secretary issues upon the 2d and 10th of each month the report of the condition of the crops. Now, every one knows that so far as certain staple crops are concerned the reports of the Secretary of Agriculture on the 2d and 10th of each month have a most important bearing on the prices that these products bring in the market, and these reports ought to be as good as can be obtained. I do not believe that the Secretary of Agriculture is correct in his statement that you can get better

or more efficient services from anybody who does it free, without any compensation at all, than you can get by obtaining competent men who are paid something for the trouble they are put to in making these reports.

Now, Mr. Chairman, that is all I desire to say. I know it is subject to a point of order, but it seems to me that those who perform the services of such great benefit to the whole country ought to be compensated for it.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman himself admits that it is subject to a point of order, and the Chair sustains the point of order.

The Clerk read as follows:

And the Secretary of Agriculture is hereby authorized to employ such assistants, clerks, and other persons as he may deem necessary, in the city of Washington and elsewhere, and to incur such other expenses for office fixtures and supplies, stationery, traveling, freight and express charges, illustration of the Experiment Station Record, bulletins, and reports, as he may find essential in carrying out the objects of the above acts, and the sums apportioned to the several States shall be paid quarterly in advance; and the Secretary of Agriculture is hereby authorized to furnish to such institutions or individuals as may care to buy them copies of the card index of agricultural literature prepared by the Office of Experiment Stations, and charge for the same a price covering the additional expense involved in the preparation of these copies, and he is hereby authorized to apply the moneys received toward the expense of the preparation of the index; and the Secretary of Agriculture is hereby authorized to expend \$45,000 of which sum to establish and maintain agricultural experiment stations in the Territories of Alaska, Hawaii, and Porto Rico, including the erection of buildings, the printing (in Hawaii and Porto Rico), illustration, and distribution of reports and bulletins: *Provided*, That not more than \$15,000 shall be expended for the maintenance of such stations in any one of said Territories; and the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to sell such products as are obtained on the land belonging to the agricultural experiment stations in Alaska, Hawaii, and Porto Rico, and to apply the moneys received from the sale of such products to the maintenance of said stations; in all, \$810,000: *Provided*, That \$5,000 of this sum shall be used by the Secretary of Agriculture to investigate and report upon the organization and progress of farmer's institutes in the several States and Territories, and upon similar organizations in foreign countries, with special suggestions of plans and methods for making such organizations more effective for the dissemination of the results of the work of the Department of Agriculture and the agricultural experiment stations and of improved methods of agricultural practice.

Total for agricultural experiment stations, \$810,000.

Mr. ADAMS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend agricultural experiment station paragraph by striking out the words "eight hundred and ten thousand," in line 16, page 46, and inserting in lieu thereof the words "one million and fifty-five thousand," and by inserting after the word "dollars," in the sixteenth line of said paragraph, the words "and from the sum hereby appropriated for the maintenance of agricultural experiment stations in accordance with said acts \$20,000 shall be paid to each State and Territory entitled to the benefits of said acts."

Also amend by striking out the words "eight hundred and ten thousand" in the thirteenth and fourteenth lines, page 48, of same paragraph, and inserting the words "one million and fifty-five thousand."

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the point of order.

Mr. ADAMS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, this amendment simply adds \$5,000 to the appropriation which each agricultural State experimental station now receives under the act of 1887. The act of 1887 was introduced by Mr. Hatch, of Missouri, for the purpose of establishing, through the aid of the Federal Government, agricultural experiment stations in the different States.

The total appropriation under that act by this amendment would only add \$240,000 to the appropriation provided in this bill, and I have asked for the passage of this amendment because the stations need the money; and I ask for it because they have done a work in the development of agricultural knowledge in making that knowledge specific, in making it valuable, in spreading it among the farmers of this country, which warrants a generous consideration on the part of the Federal Government.

The agricultural experiment stations have done more than any other one influence in the United States to bring the business of farming out of mists and fog and superstition and to put it in the realm of absolute ascertained fact. Any number of instances can be given of the specific things which these experimental stations have done. They have made a record which has been rich in value to the agriculture of the United States.

Take the one experimental station in Wisconsin and one single instance of the work which Professor Babcock did when he devised and worked out the Babcock test. Up to that time there had been no measure of the commercial value of milk, no simple way in which you could tell what milk was worth. A farmer who carried to the factory 100 pounds of milk containing 3 pounds of butter fat got as much money as the farmer who carried 100 pounds of milk that contained 5 pounds of butter fat and which was worth nearly twice as much. Mr. Babcock devised a simple test which any farmer can use, which can be used in any creamery or factory, and that test has gone all over the civilized world. It is used in Finland; it is used in England; it is used in France; it is used in Madagascar; it is used in South Africa; it is used everywhere where cows are milked to determine the value of that milk product.

Now, I want to say to you that the dairy product of the United

States amounts to \$500,000,000 every year, and it has been materially benefited by the introduction of this simple process. Mr. Babcock was urged by his friends, when he made that discovery, to withdraw from the Wisconsin University, to put this into use for his own benefit, and patent the process. If he had done so, he would have become a millionaire beyond any question. But he said, "I was employed by the Federal Government to work for the farmers of this country, and they are entitled to the fruit of my labor unhampered by the cost of a patent." This one discovery has been worth more to the dairy interests of the United States than it costs to run the National Government for six months.

Not only that, but look at what we have done with cheese up there. The Wisconsin experimental station has been studying the question of curing cheese and has found out that you can send your cheese direct to the cold storage, without the intervention of any curing room, and cure it and make the finest cheese that can be produced. These are practical things. Not only that, but in every State in this Union is this same work being carried on. In Texas they are working on the development of beef breeds of cattle and in food. Up in Minnesota they are developing new varieties of wheat. In New York they are bringing out new ideas respecting the cultivation of orchards.

In Minnesota, again, they are studying the question as to the nutritive value of food, and in all the experimental stations of the United States they are studying those practical questions which lie right at the base of farm life. And I want to say to you, gentlemen, it seems to me that when we come in here and ask for a little addition of \$240,000 to this appropriation for this work which is so definite and so specific and so productive of great practical results we can hardly afford to deny the request, because we have the money. We saved it for the people of this country when we turned back our mileage account. That alone is sufficient. [Applause and laughter.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may be allowed to proceed for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent that the gentleman from Wisconsin may be permitted to proceed for five minutes more. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. ADAMS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, let me call the attention of gentlemen here who may think they are economical in opposing an appropriation like this to the fact that you appropriate millions of dollars to establish a Department of Commerce and Labor, without which this Government was run very well for a hundred years. I am glad you did it; I am for it. You passed an appropriation bill giving \$136,000,000 to the pensioners of the wars of this country, and you did well. You go head over heels into the Panama Canal scheme, almost without a division, which means a certain expenditure of \$200,000,000 and a probable expenditure of \$500,000,000, and I am with you.

You do some other things. You provide for the building of a battle ship which costs \$4,000,000, and which will rust upon the waters unless somebody gets foolish, and I think you do well. You give \$5,000,000 to the St. Louis Exposition, where the industries and genius of America will be exhibited, and I think you do well; but when we come in here and ask for only \$240,000 to add to the appropriation for these little experimental stations that are working out practical problems that lie around the lives of 9,000,000 men who toil on the farms of this country, it seems to me we are not asking too much.

I do not want to whoop it up for the farmer. I do not want to dazzle you with a lot of statistics, but this thing I do want to say about the farmers of this country: There are a lot of them, and you never hear of a lot of farmers engaged in rioting. They are the defenders of law. You never hear of a lot of farmers organizing a trust to harm anybody; and in the conflicts which are to come in this country and are certain to come between the power of capital and the power of labor the American farmer will be the man who is going to do the country the most good, because he represents not only the interests of labor but the interests of capital as well.

You are going to need him, and he will be there to stand for the dignity of American law, for the rights of property, and the rights of the men who toil; and so when in Congress you can do something like this which is definite, which does not take very much money, for Heaven's sake do it, because the American farmer and our agricultural interests deserve it. [Applause.]

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I regret very much after hearing the gentleman's eloquent speech to still feel compelled to raise the point of order that the proposed amendment changes existing law.

The CHAIRMAN. As the Chair understands the amendment

it changes the law on the statute books to-day, which gives \$20,000 each to agricultural colleges. That is clearly a change of existing law, and the point of order is sustained.

The Clerk read as follows:

Public road inquiries: To enable the Secretary of Agriculture to make inquiries in regard to the systems of road management throughout the United States; to make investigations in regard to the best methods of road making, and the best kinds of road-making materials in the several States; to conduct experiments; for the employment of local and special agents, clerks, assistants, and other labor required in the city of Washington and elsewhere; for collating, digesting, reporting, and illustrating the results of such investigations and experiments; for preparing, publishing, and distributing bulletins and reports; for necessary office fixtures and supplies, apparatus, and materials; telegraph and telephone service, traveling, and other necessary expenses, and to enable him to assist the agricultural colleges and experiment stations in disseminating information on this subject, \$35,000.

Mr. HEPBURN. I wish to ask the gentleman in charge of the bill [Mr. WADSWORTH] whether this sum of \$35,000 is the amount asked for by the Department?

Mr. WADSWORTH. No; the Secretary asked for \$65,000, but we gave \$10,000 to the Bureau of Chemistry. If the gentleman will turn back to that—

Mr. HEPBURN. Well, that is understood, then?

Mr. WADSWORTH. The total appropriation here for good roads amounts to \$45,000.

Mr. HEPBURN. Would you object to having this appropriation increased to \$55,000?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I would seriously, because I think good and efficient work is being done under the present appropriation.

Mr. HEPBURN. I move to amend by striking out \$35,000 and inserting \$55,000. I make this motion because I know there is scarcely any subject that is receiving more attention throughout the country at large just now than this subject of good roads. I think there is less known perhaps about the making of good roads, in some parts of the country at least, than almost any other subject. The Department is doing good work, but would do very much better work if it had larger means at its disposal for this purpose.

Mr. BOWIE. Does the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HEPBURN] understand that this is really an increase of \$10,000 net for this service, because the \$10,000 which has heretofore been used for chemical work has been transferred to another division, so that the appropriation here is net, making a real increase of \$10,000?

Mr. HEPBURN. I understood that to be the statement of the chairman of the committee [Mr. WADSWORTH], that this was practically an increase.

Mr. BOWIE. Yes; practically an increase of \$10,000.

Mr. HEPBURN. I do not care to take up the time of the committee, but I do think this is a matter of importance, and I hope the Committee of the Whole will sustain my amendment.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I will only say to the gentleman that the Committee on Agriculture took this matter into very careful consideration, and the increase practically granted is \$10,000. I take it that nobody on the floor of this House is ready yet to have the United States Government go into localities in the several States and build roads. All that the United States ought properly to do is to disseminate information in regard to the building of roads, and perhaps with the aid of the localities to furnish an object lesson in road making. That is as far as the United States Government ought to go. Thirty-five thousand dollars, which, as already stated, is practically an increase of \$10,000, is, in the judgment of the committee, an ample appropriation for this work.

Mr. TAWNEY. Will the gentleman permit a question?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I will.

Mr. TAWNEY. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HEPBURN] has stated what every Member of the House knows—that there is a very strong pressure for legislation upon the subject of good roads—and the gentleman from New York himself has expressed the fear that this pressure might become so strong as to increase very materially the appropriations along that line.

Mr. WADSWORTH. When did I express that fear?

Mr. TAWNEY. A moment ago. Do you not think it a fact that if we expend a little more money in the matter of investigation such as the Agricultural Department is now making, it will tend to satisfy the Department to a very great extent?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I do not think so.

Mr. TAWNEY. And do you not think that if in the judgment of the Secretary of Agriculture it is necessary that a certain amount should be appropriated, it ought to be done?

Mr. WADSWORTH. Not necessarily, no. The committee and the Secretary of Agriculture have many honest differences of opinion as to the amount of money that can be judiciously expended within the fiscal year.

It must be remembered that this appropriation has been going on for a series of years, and will go on probably for a good many years after we are all dead. The question for this Committee of the Whole to meet here and now is how much money can be judiciously expended in the coming fiscal year.

Mr. TAWNEY. Is it not a fact that information on this subject is being disseminated more largely than it was?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I think that a certain sentiment is being "worked up" on this subject. Many of the letters I get show evidence of being worked up by some influence here.

Mr. HAUGEN. Is it not understood that the additional appropriation asked for here is for the purpose of building these sample roads; and is not the appropriation we now make sufficient to carry on the work that is now being carried on by the Department?

Mr. HEPBURN. So far as I am concerned, I have no direct information as to how the Secretary would expend this money. But he has said that he could judiciously and properly spend \$60,000 in making this inquiry with the machinery that he now has. I think, with due deference to the committee, that I would rather have his opinion as to what amount it is proper to expend in making the inquiry than the opinion of gentlemen who are not nearly so conversant with the possibilities.

Mr. WADSWORTH. If that is true, I will say to the gentleman from Iowa that there is no use in having any committees.

Mr. HEPBURN. Oh, yes, there is. This is no reflection upon the committee.

Mr. WADSWORTH. If the judgment of a Cabinet officer is better than that of any committee of this House, then there is no need of any committee.

Mr. HEPBURN. I think the gentleman is supersensitive about it.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Let me say to the gentleman that since 1895-96 that investigation, which commenced with an appropriation of \$10,000, has received increasing appropriations until it is now practically \$45,000 in seven years. With the work they have done and are doing, and the work they will continue to do, I think every demand of the country will be met by this appropriation.

Mr. HEPBURN. Mr. Chairman, this is not a very large addition. The Secretary has said that he can properly use it. I believe that the great majority of the gentlemen in this committee have confidence in what he says. We think, however, that this will be properly expended, and therefore it is that I insist upon my amendment. I also insist that there is no reflection upon the committee, and that to agree to this amendment would not be tantamount to declaring that the great Committee of Agriculture is not important, that it does not accomplish great good, and that the country would not seriously suffer if anything should happen to it or to its efficiency.

I am not attacking the committee; I am simply saying that there is another person in the country with larger information, with better opportunities to know what he can judiciously do, than any one of them or all of them, who has disagreed with them, and I for one coincide with his opinion rather perhaps than with that more learned and astute opinion of the gentleman from New York.

Mr. WADSWORTH. One moment. I wish to call attention to the note in the estimate on the paragraph for road experiments. One of the things sought by getting the larger appropriation is "object lessons in road building," "the purchase of machinery," and going absolutely into the road-building business. Now, the committee objected to that and struck out that language, and simply confined it to disseminating knowledge in regard to road building.

Mr. HEPBURN. Yes; but you are unwilling that they should acquire this knowledge. This appropriation perhaps will enable them to secure that information that everybody wants.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, just a word. I wish to say in reply to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HEPBURN] that the Committee on Agriculture have the utmost confidence in the Secretary of Agriculture. This committee have labored for more than a month, in sessions from 10 o'clock in the morning until 6 in the evening. We have given extensive hearings. Here is a volume of 451 pages.

All of these matters have been carefully considered, and after listening to the Secretary and the gentleman in charge of this division, Mr. Dodge, the committee concluded that the \$35,000 was all that could be judiciously expended at this time. Now, if it is a proposition here to build these roads, as has been suggested, is the gentleman from Iowa now ready to build roads in Iowa at an expense of three hundred or four hundred million dollars? If that is the policy, then let us increase the appropriation.

Mr. HEPBURN. Mr. Chairman, there is no similarity between the proposition that I have made and this inane proposition of expending three or four hundred million dollars in building roads. I do not want anything of that kind. I have not advocated it. What I want is the information, properly acquired, and then disseminated throughout the country that will enable localities to build their own roads. I have not been an advocate of road building by the Federal Government.

I have never said anything of that kind here or elsewhere, but

I do think that there can be no wiser expenditure of money than the expenditure of this additional \$20,000 in securing the information upon this subject that is wanted in all parts of the country.

Mr. HAUGEN. My understanding is that if the total amount asked for is allowed a portion of that money will be used for the building of these expensive roads and the purchase of machinery. The committee did not deem it advisable to go into the building of these expensive roads at this time.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Let me say one word. In addition to that appropriation there are from \$1,500 to \$3,000 expended for printing the good-roads bulletins, so that you must add that to the cost of the good-roads bureau.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HEPBURN].

The question was taken; and upon a division there were—ayes 40, noes 48.

Accordingly the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk resumed and completed the reading of the bill.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to turn back to page 18, and in line 17 to insert the word "five" instead of the word "three;" so that it shall read:

Forty thousand dollars, \$5,000 of which sum may, in the discretion of the Secretary, be expended in cooperation with the experiment station of the State of California for studying the nature of Anaheim and other diseases of vines, and for ascertaining the best means for protecting vineyards against their ravages.

I do this at the earnest request of the gentleman from California [Mr. BELL] and other gentlemen of that delegation, who claim that this disease, Anaheim, is a serious threat to their industry. It does not increase the total appropriation, but simply makes \$5,000 available for this investigation instead of three thousand.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York.

The question was taken; and the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Now, Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee rise and report the bill, with the amendments, to the House with a favorable recommendation.

The motion was agreed to.

The committee accordingly rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. POWERS of Maine, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill H. R. 11825 and had directed him to report the same back with amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be adopted, and that the bill as amended do pass.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and amendments to its final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any of the amendments? If not, they will be submitted in gross.

The amendments were agreed to in gross.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading; and being engrossed, it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. WADSWORTH, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

AGRICULTURAL EXPERIMENT STATIONS.

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read, referred to the Committee on Printing, and ordered to be printed:

To the Senate and House of Representatives:

I transmit herewith the Annual Report of the Office of Experiment Stations, prepared under the direction of the Secretary of Agriculture, which includes a report on the work and expenditures of the agricultural experiment stations in the United States for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1903, in accordance with the act making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the said fiscal year.

The attention of the Congress is called to the request of the Secretary of Agriculture that 5,000 copies of the report be printed for the use of the Department of Agriculture, and that provision be made to print such a report annually.

THEODORE ROOSEVELT.

WHITE HOUSE, February 5, 1904.

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT.

Mr. WACHTER, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that this day they presented to the President of the United States, for his approval, the following joint resolution:

H. J. Res. 98. Joint resolution to provide for the removal of snow and ice from the streets, cross walks, and gutters of the District of Columbia.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

Mr. WACHTER also, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that they had examined and found truly enrolled bill of the following title; when the Speaker signed the same.

H. R. 6331. An act granting an increase of pension to James N. Dickey.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bill of the following title:

S. 707. An act to amend an act entitled "An act providing the terms and places of holding the courts of the United States in the district of Minnesota, and for other purposes," approved April 26, 1890.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, Senate bills of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and referred to their appropriate committees as indicated below:

S. 3916. An act to amend section 2699 of the Revised Statutes, relating to compensation of collectors of customs—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

S. 4122. An act to direct the Director of the Census to cooperate with the secretary of state of the State of Michigan in taking the census of manufactures, and for other purposes—to the Committee on the Census.

S. 3800. An act donating gun carriages to the Connecticut commissioners for the care and preservation of Fort Griswold—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

WITHDRAWAL OF PAPERS FROM FILES.

Mr. KENNEDY obtained unanimous consent to withdraw from the files, without leaving copies thereof, the papers in the case of Henry Weimit, Fifty-seventh Congress, no adverse report having been made thereon.

ADJOURNMENT OVER UNTIL MONDAY.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I move that when the House adjourn to-day it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The question was taken, and the motion was agreed to.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 15 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until Monday next.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, the following executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

A letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings filed by the court in the case of James Keizer, administrator of estate of James Glover, against The United States—to the Committee on War Claims, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the conclusions of fact and law in the French spoliation cases relating to the schooner *Variety*, Micah Dyer, master—to the Committee on Claims, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report of examination and survey of Waccamaw River, North Carolina and South Carolina—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and ordered to be printed, with illustrations.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, bills and resolutions of the following titles were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the several Calendars therein named, as follows:

Mr. DE ARMOND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 8681) to detach the county of Linn, in the State of Missouri, from the western and attach it to the eastern judicial district of said State, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 730); which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SHAFROTH, from the Committee on the Public Lands, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 11812) relating to applications, declaratory statements, entries, and final proofs under the homestead and other land laws, and to confirm the same in certain cases when made outside of the land district within which the land is situated, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 731); which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. STEVENS of Minnesota, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 8160) to declare a portion of the Minnesota River, in the State of Minnesota, not navigable, and authorizing the construction of bridges thereon, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 732); which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. CRUMPACKER, from the Committee on the Census, to

which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 11823) to authorize the Director of the Census to cooperate with the secretary of state of the State of Michigan and with officials of other States in taking the census of manufactures, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 733); which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. ADAMSON, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 462) to construct and place a light-ship off the outer bar of Brunswick, Ga., reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 734); which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. HERMANN, from the Committee on Indian Affairs, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 1490) to authorize the sale of a part of what is known as the Red Lake Indian Reservation, in the State of Minnesota, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 735); which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials of the following titles were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. LORIMER (by request): A bill (H. R. 11878) in relation to national mortgage banks—to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. TAWNEY: A bill (H. R. 11879) to provide for the consolidation and reorganization of customs collection districts—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BARTLETT: A bill (H. R. 11880) to provide for the recutting of the great seal of the United States from the original model—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FULLER: A bill (H. R. 11881) granting pensions to soldiers and sailors who served in the war of the rebellion, and to the widows of such soldiers and sailors—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. POWERS of Massachusetts: A bill (H. R. 11882) to provide public convenience stations in the city of Washington, D. C.—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. RIDER: A bill (H. R. 11883) to provide for free lectures to the people in the District of Columbia—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. SOUTHARD: A bill (H. R. 11884) providing naval training station on Put in Bay Island, in Lake Erie—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11885) to amend section 914 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, relating to practice in the circuit and district courts—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota: A bill (H. R. 11886) for the erection of a public building at Faribault, Minn.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11887) to provide for the investigation of infectious diseases of domestic animals prevalent in the State of Minnesota and adjoining States—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HEARST: A bill (H. R. 11888) to empower United States attorneys, without the direction of the Attorney-General, to enforce the act to protect trade and commerce against unlawful restraints and monopolies, and for other purposes—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FLOOD: A bill (H. R. 11889) for the relief of the tobacco growers—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WANGER: A bill (H. R. 11890) granting pensions to certain soldiers and sailors who served in the war of the rebellion, and their widows—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ALLEN (by request): A bill (H. R. 11953) to establish a public park on Columbia Heights and to make a new street on its western boundary—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. AIKEN: A bill (H. R. 11954) to establish in the Department of Agriculture a bureau to be known as the Bureau of Public Highways, and to provide for national aid in the improvement of the public roads—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. GIBSON: A bill (H. R. 11955) for the erection of a public building at Harriman, Tenn.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. STEPHENS of Texas: A resolution (H. Res. 204) asking the Secretary of the Interior to furnish certain information relating to Indian affairs in the Indian Territory to the House of Representatives—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. STEVENS of Minnesota: A resolution (H. Res. 205) authorizing the purchase of 40 copies of the Compiled Statutes of the United States for 1901, with the Supplement for 1903—to the Committee on Accounts.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BATES: A bill (H. R. 11891) granting an increase of pension to James L. Hart—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions. Also, a bill (H. R. 11892) granting a pension to Clinton G. Ames—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BENNY: A bill (H. R. 11893) for the relief of George W. Spencer—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BRADLEY: A bill (H. R. 11894) granting an increase of pension to Jeremiah Sheldon—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BREAZEALE: A bill (H. R. 11895) for the relief of the First Baptist Church of Mansfield, La.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. BUCKMAN: A bill (H. R. 11896) granting an increase of pension to Giles A. Woolsey—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11897) granting an increase of pension to Samuel H. Hamilton—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11898) granting a pension to Bailey D. Judkins—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11899) granting a pension to May L. Whitney—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BRUNDIDGE: A bill (H. R. 11900) for the relief of Shadrack H. Wren, of Izard County, Ark.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. DANIELS: A bill (H. R. 11901) for the appropriation of water from the Colorado River for irrigation purposes—to the Committee on Irrigation of Arid Lands.

By Mr. GUDGER: A bill (H. R. 11902) for relief of Mrs. Mary Gaddy—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HEDGE: A bill (H. R. 11903) granting a pension to Bertha C. Hoffmeister—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HERMANN: A bill (H. R. 11904) granting an increase of pension to Benjamin Hayden—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11905) granting a pension to Rebecca Butler—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HENRY of Texas: A bill (H. R. 11906) granting a pension to Margaret Jones—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HOGG: A bill (H. R. 11907) granting an honorable discharge to Thomas B. Hanoum—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11908) for the relief of the legal representatives of G. B. Stimpson—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. JACKSON of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 11909) granting a pension to Charles H. McCleary—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11910) granting an increase of pension to Florian Smith—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11911) granting an increase of pension to John F. Zeller—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11912) granting an increase of pension to Henry Balskey—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11913) granting an increase of pension to Erwin M. Bergstresser, now Erwin M. Harley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11914) granting an increase of pension to Charles F. Keyerleber—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11915) granting an increase of pension to Patrick Connors—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11916) granting an increase of pension to Alfred Williamson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KENNEDY: A bill (H. R. 11917) granting a pension to Henry Law—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11918) granting an increase of pension to Henry Older—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11919) granting an increase of pension to William F. Tarbet—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11920) granting an increase of pension to Joseph P. Boals—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11921) granting an increase of pension to Alfred Snowberger—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11922) granting an increase of pension to George Fetterman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11923) granting an increase of pension to George J. Baker—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11924) granting an increase of pension to Andrew J. Lane—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11925) granting an increase of pension to Ludwig Evans—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11926) granting an increase of pension to Andrew Kinkade—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KLINE: A bill (H. R. 11927) granting a pension to Paul Smith—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KNAPP: A bill (H. R. 11928) for the relief of James T. Kilbreth, George R. Bidwell, and Nevada N. Stranahan, as collectors of customs for the district and port of New York—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. LANNING: A bill (H. R. 11929) granting an increase of pension to William Antes—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11930) granting an increase of pension to Virginia Hart Clark—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LITTAUER: A bill (H. R. 11931) granting an increase of pension to B. W. Burnham—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LITTLEFIELD: A bill (H. R. 11932) granting a pension to Hannah Small Wiggin—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MEYER of Louisiana: A bill (H. R. 11933) for the relief of Samuel W. Evans—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11934) for the relief of the legal representatives of the late firm of Lapène & Ferré—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. MONDELL: A bill (H. R. 11935) granting an increase of pension to John Watson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MCCARTHY: A bill (H. R. 11936) granting an increase of pension to John L. St. Clair—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. OVERSTREET: A bill (H. R. 11937) granting an increase of pension to Daniel Spurrier—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas: A bill (H. R. 11938) for the relief of Thomas J. Estes—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11939) granting an increase of pension to C. C. Fisher—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SHACKLEFORD: A bill (H. R. 11940) granting a pension to Mathias Hilden—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SHAFROTH: A bill (H. R. 11941) granting an increase of pension to John H. Burrowes—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11942) granting a pension to William J. F. Barcus—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11943) granting a pension to Mary J. Chenoweth—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WM. ALDEN SMITH: A bill (H. R. 11944) for the relief of John W. McGrath—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. THOMAS of Iowa: A bill (H. R. 11945) granting an increase of pension to John Westfall—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11946) granting an increase of pension to Henry P. Swartz—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. VAN DUZER: A bill (H. R. 11947) to reimburse certain persons who expended moneys and furnished services and supplies in repelling invasions and suppressing Indian hostilities within the territorial limits of the present State of Nevada—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11948) granting a pension to Charles F. J. Stein—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WACHTER: A bill (H. R. 11949) granting a pension to Katesbury R. Warrington—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WATSON: A bill (H. R. 11950) for the relief of William E. Murray—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. GIBSON: A bill (H. R. 11951) granting an increase of pension to Henry N. McLane—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DUNWELL: A bill (H. R. 11952) for the relief of Noah L. Cochen—to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, the following petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Resolution of Apperson Post, No. 202, Grand Army of the Republic, of Neoga, Ill., in favor of a service-pension bill—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ADAMSON: Resolution of Lodge No. 649, Brotherhood of Railway Trainmen, of Columbus, Ga., indorsing the Grosvenor anti-injunction bill—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BARTHOLODT: Resolution of St. Louis Merchants' Exchange, in favor of increasing the powers of the Interstate Commerce Commission—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of the Cramer Dry Plate Company, of St. Louis, in favor of a reduction of the tax on alcohol—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Pacific Lodge, No. 64, Brotherhood of Rail-

road Trainmen, in favor of bills H. R. 89 and 7041—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BARTLETT: Memorial and resolution of the general committee of the Daughters of the American Revolution, for the recutting of the Great Seal of the United States from the original model—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BASSETT: Resolution of the New York State assembly, relative to a bill to promote the efficiency of the Life-Saving Service—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BEALL of Texas: Petition of Rev. R. S. Selle and others, of Dallas, Tex., for the passage of the Hepburn-Dolliver bill—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BENNY: Paper to accompany bill to correct military record of George W. Spencer—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BRUNDIDGE: Protest of business men of Swifton, Ark., against the passage of the parcels-post bill—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, petition of A. F. Smith and 85 others, J. B. Hammier, M. D., and 45 others, and Prof. W. A. Cunningham and 40 others, of Searcy, Ark., for the passage of the Hepburn-Dolliver bill—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, papers to accompany claim of Shadrach H. Wren—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. BURKETT: Resolutions of organized agriculture and several agricultural societies of Nebraska, indorsing bill H. R. 8678, relative to experiment stations—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BURNETT: Petition of V. M. Brindley and 61 other voters of Collensville, Ala., for the passage of the Hepburn-Dolliver bill—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUTLER of Pennsylvania: Resolution of Elizabeth Temple Post, No. 138, and John Brown Post, No. 194, Grand Army of the Republic, Department of Pennsylvania, in favor of a service-pension bill—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CALDERHEAD: Resolution of John Buford Post, No. 89, Grand Army of the Republic, Everett, Wash., in favor of a service-pension law—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CALDWELL: Resolutions of Decatur Lodge, No. 414, Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, of Decatur, Ill., in favor of the passage of bills H. R. 89 and 7041—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of business men of Edinburg, Ill., and of Nokomis, Ill., against the passage of the parcels-post bill—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. CANDLER: Petition of Rev. James H. Felts and 587 others, of Corinth, Miss., in favor of the Hepburn-Dolliver bill—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CRUMPACKER: Petition of the First Presbyterian Church, William H. Wilson, pastor, of Michigan City, Ind., for the passage of the Hepburn-Dolliver bill—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DALZELL: Petition of Susan H. Evans and others, in favor of the Hepburn-Dolliver bill—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota: Resolution of Michael Cook Post, No. 123, Grand Army of the Republic, Faribault, Minn., in favor of service-pension bill—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DRAPER: Resolution of the Central Federation of Labor, of Troy, N. Y., in favor of bill H. R. 6—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DUNWELL: Resolution of G. K. Warren Post, No. 286, Grand Army of the Republic, of Brooklyn, N. Y., and of memorial and executive committee, representing 31 posts in Brooklyn, N. Y., favoring the passage of a service-pension law—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ESCH: Resolution of the New York State assembly, relative to the promotion of efficiency of the Life-Saving Service—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. GAINES of West Virginia: Petition of Theodore Alver, State superintendent, and others, for the passage of the Hepburn-Dolliver bill—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts: Resolutions of Charles Sumner Post, No. 101, of Groveland; A. W. Bartlett Post, No. 49, of Newburyport; Preston Post, No. 118, of Beverly Farms; John H. Chipman Post, No. 89, of Beverly; Colonel C. R. Mudge Post, No. 114, of Merrimac; Major How Post, No. 47, of Haverhill, and Phil A. Sheridan Post, No. 84, of Salem, all in Massachusetts, Grand Army of the Republic, in favor of a service-pension bill—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GRIFFITH: Petition of W. W. Howe, to accompany bill H. R. 1430, for refund of taxes illegally paid—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, petition of Samuel Wymond Cooperage Company, of Aurora, Ind., against passage of bill to limit the word "conspiracy," and for other purposes—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of the Blish Milling Company, of Seymour, Ind., for the passage of bill H. R. 6273, to prevent the discrimination in freight between localities and commodities—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. GROSVENOR: Petitions of H. H. Stine and 14 others, and G. W. Walker, jr., and 43 others, of Roseville, Ohio, favoring the passage of the Hepburn-Dolliver bill—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of the Methodist Episcopal Church officials and 21 other voters of Athens, Ohio, urging the passage of the Hepburn-Dolliver bill—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HENRY: Petition of W. W. Woodson and 94 others, for the passage of the Hepburn-Dolliver bill—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HEPBURN: Petition of S. Samson and 70 other voters of Van Wert, Iowa, urging the passage of the Hepburn-Dolliver bill—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HERMANN: Petition of citizens of Oregon, against parcels-post bill—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, petition of the mayor of Woodburn, Oreg., for increasing pay of rural carriers—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. HINSHAW: Petition of pastors of churches for the passage of the Hepburn-Dolliver bill—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HITT: Resolutions of Polo Post, No. 84, of Polo, Ill., and J. M. Smith Post, No. 720, of Mount Morris, Ill., Grand Army of the Republic, in favor of a service-pension bill—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HOGG: Petitions of Rev. B. E. Hart and 32 others, of Canyon City, Colo.; Rev. J. B. Cook, representing a church membership of 550, and William L. Perry and 60 others, of Cedaredge, Colo., for the passage of the Hepburn-Dolliver bill—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOWELL of New Jersey: Petitions of Rev. Alfred Wagg and 43 others, of Red Bank, N. J.; Rev. J. H. White and 8 others, of Asbury Park, N. J., and Thomas W. Leonard and 33 others, of Atlantic Highlands, N. J., for the passage of the Hepburn-Dolliver bill—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HUGHES of New Jersey: Resolutions of Henry W. Slocum Post, No. 55, of New Jersey, and James B. McPherson Post, No. 52, of Hackensack, N. J., Grand Army of the Republic, favoring the passage of a service-pension bill—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition of B. J. Morgan and 16 others; William McConnell and 14 others, of Stanhope, N. J., and James Wiley and 43 others, of Patterson, N. J., for the passage of the Hepburn-Dolliver bill—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JACKSON of Ohio: Papers to accompany bill to increase pension of Florian Smith—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, papers to accompany bill to increase pension of Charles H. McCleary—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KEHOE: Petition of sundry farmers of Bourbon County, Ky., indorsing bill H. R. 9669, relative to the adulteration of blue grass, orchard grass, and clover seed—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. LANNING (by request): Petition of General Assembly of Presbyterian Church in the United States, relative to issuance of tax receipts by the Federal Government in prohibitory States, etc.—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LAWRENCE: Petition of Rev. J. W. Stephan and 29 others, of Greenfield, Mass., for the passage of the Hepburn-Dolliver bill—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LITTLEFIELD: Petition of B. H. Davis and 24 others, of New Sharon, Me.; Rev. H. S. Trueman and 43 others, of Kingfield, Me.; C. N. Blanchard and 39 others, of Wilton, Me.; George C. Burington and 29 others, of Farmington, Me., and F. L. Porter and 11 others, of Eustis, Me., for the passage of the Hepburn-Dolliver bill—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LIVERNASH: Resolutions of the Manufacturers and Producers' Association of California, favoring the Lodge bill relating to reorganization of consular service of the United States—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, resolutions of the board of directors of the Manufacturers and Producers' Association of California, favoring legislation for revival of American merchant marine in the foreign carrying trade—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, memorial of the board of supervisors of city and county of San Francisco to the President and Congress of the United States, in relation to Tuolumne River and Lake Eleanor rights of way—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, resolutions of the board of directors of the Manufacturers and Producers' Association of California, favoring the adoption of the metric system of weights and measures—to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

By Mr. LOUDENSLAGER: Petitions of Samuel A. Bacon and 18 others, of Haddonfield; Rev. William G. Robinson and 9 others, of Newfield; J. C. Snelbaker and 21 others, of Woodstown and vicinity, and George L. Van Alen and 16 others, of Blackwood, all in New Jersey, for the passage of the Hepburn-Dolliver bill—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MARSHALL: Petition of E. Watts, R. Horne, and J. B. Ross, trustees of the Methodist Episcopal Church, and 9 others, of Leonard, N. Dak., for the passage of the Hepburn-Dolliver bill—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of J. W. Bliss and 22 others, of Lakota, N. Dak.; Will. H. Carliter and 67 others, of Griggs County, N. Dak., and Ezra Rose Camp and 35 others, of St. Thomas, N. Dak., in favor of the Hepburn-Dolliver bill—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. MEYER of Louisiana: Memorial to accompany bill for relief of Samuel W. Evans—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, resolutions of Oscar Orillion Post, No. 14, Grand Army of the Republic, of Louisiana, in favor of a service-pension law—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. OVERSTREET: Papers to accompany bill to increase pension of Dennis Spurrier—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PAYNE: Petitions of Jesse P. Knapp and 38 other voters of the towns of Barrington and Starkey, N. Y., and W. H. Laraby and 8 other voters of Starkey, N. Y., urging the passage of the Hepburn-Dolliver bill—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of the Chamber of Commerce of New York City, relating to the transportation of merchandise between the United States and the Philippine Islands—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. PORTER: Papers to accompany bill H. R. 11866, to correct the military record of Cereach Schnepf—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. RIXEY: Petition of George Roberts, M. D., and 30 others, of Lincoln, Va., and vicinity, and of W. T. Davis and 32 others, of Purcellville, Va., favoring the passage of the Hepburn-Dolliver bill—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROBERTS: Resolutions of Major-General H. G. Berry Post, No. 40, of Malden, Mass., and J. P. Gould Post, No. 75, of Stoneham, Mass., Grand Army of the Republic, and Union Veterans' Union of Chelsea, Mass., in favor of a service-pension bill—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana: Petition of Samuel Houk, of Bingen, Ind., relative to increasing the powers of the Interstate Commerce Commission—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SHACKLEFORD: Papers to accompany bill H. R. 7619—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. SHULL: Paper to accompany bill H. R. 11872, granting a pension to Howard S. Gardner—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SNOOK: Resolutions of Salem Evangelical Sunday School, of Defiance County, Ohio, protesting against a repeal of the anticanteneen law—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SPERRY: Petition and papers from the National Society of the Daughters of the American Revolution, praying for a specific appropriation for the cutting of the reverse face of the Great Seal, and that it be placed in the custody of the Department of State for such purposes as may be appropriate—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STEVENS of Minnesota: Resolution of the New York State assembly, relative to the promotion of efficiency in the Life-Saving Service—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, resolution of the Live Stock Breeders' Association of Minnesota, relative to investigation and study of infectious diseases among domestic animals—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, resolution of Michael Cook Post, No. 123, Grand Army of the Republic, of Faribault, Minn., in favor of a service-pension bill—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition of Rev. S. Phoenix and others, of Stillwater, Minn., against sale of liquor in Government buildings, etc.—to the Committee on Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.

Also, resolution of citizens of Washington County, Minn., relative to compensation of rural carriers—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, resolution of the St. Paul Board of Trade, relative to increasing the powers of the Interstate Commerce Commission—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. THOMAS of Iowa: Petition of 12 voters of Salix, 25 voters of Cherokee, 49 voters of Dickens, 29 voters of Ida Grove, 54 voters of Irwood, 19 voters of Hinton, 17 voters of Seney, 33 voters of Doon, and Society of Friends of Oskaloosa, all of Iowa, and 12 citizens of Croftonville, Cal., praying for the passage of the Hepburn-Dolliver bill—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, resolutions of McDowell Post, No. 391, of Early; General Bell Post, No. 332, of Kingsley; Hartley Post, No. 451, of Hartley;

Winget Post, No. 226, of Winget; Kenyon Post, No. 339, of Kenyon; Mathew Gray Post, No. 93, of Ida Grove; Hanscom Post, No. 97, of Hanscom; James Miller Post, No. 503, of Marathon; Laundy Post, No. 215, of Ireton; Wallar Post, No. 223, of Milford; William D. Price Post, No. 392, of Schaller; Custer Post, No. 25, of Cherokee; Stephen A. Hurlburt Post, No. 82, of Alta; Annett Post, No. 124, of Annett; General Hancock Post, No. 22, of Sioux City, and Peter Vanorman Post, No. 519, all in Iowa, Grand Army of the Republic, in favor of a service-pension bill—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TOWNSEND: Petition of Rev. N. E. Dennis and 23 others, of Seneca, Mich., and E. W. Ryan and 56 others, of Detroit, Mich., for the passage of the Hepburn-Dylliver bill—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WACHTER: Petition of the American Towing and Lightering Company, of Baltimore, against passage of bill S. 3861, relative to inspection of seagoing barges—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, resolution of Merchants and Manufacturers' Association of Baltimore, in opposition to parcels-post bill—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. WANGER: Resolutions of Captain H. Clay Beatty Post, No. 73, Grand Army of the Republic, of Bristol, Pa., in favor of a service-pension law—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi: Petitions of S. G. Cooper, F. H. Ray, and others, of Canton, Madison County, Miss., for the passage of the Hepburn-Dolliver bill—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WYNN: Papers to accompany bill H. R. 3533, granting an increase of pension to Capt. R. H. McIlroy—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, memorial of board of supervisors of the city and county of San Francisco, relative to Tuolumne River and Lake Eleanor reservoir rights of way—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

SENATE.

MONDAY, February 8, 1904.

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. EDWARD EVERETT HALE.

The Secretary proceeded to read the Journal of the proceedings of Friday last, when, on request of Mr. BURROWS, and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Journal will stand approved.

POST-OFFICE DEPARTMENT INVESTIGATION.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a communication from the Postmaster-General, transmitting, in response to a resolution of the 5th instant, the full report of the honorable Fourth Assistant Postmaster-General, dated October 24, 1903, together with other letters, reports, and communications bearing upon the investigation of the irregularities in the Post-Office Department by Assistant Postmaster-General Bristow, etc.; which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads, and ordered to be printed.

FRENCH SPOILIATION CLAIMS.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a communication from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting the conclusions of fact and of law filed under the act of January 20, 1885, in the French spoliation claims set out in the findings by the court relating to the vessel schooner *Active*, Samuel Pote, master; which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Claims, and ordered to be printed.

He also laid before the Senate a communication from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting the conclusions of fact and of law filed under the act of January 20, 1885, in the French spoliation claims set out in the findings by the court relating to the vessel schooner *Apollo*, John Ring, master; which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Claims, and ordered to be printed.

PRESIDENTIAL APPROVALS.

A message from the President of the United States, by Mr. B. F. BARNES, one of his secretaries, announced that the President had on the 5th instant approved and signed the act (S. 2795) to amend an act entitled "An act for the regulation of the practice of dentistry in the District of Columbia, and for the protection of the people from empiricism in relation thereto," approved June 6, 1892.

The message also announced that the President of the United States had on the 6th instant approved and signed the act (S. 540) providing for an additional officer in the district of Chicago, in the collection district of Indiana and Illinois.